

THE
ROAD TO PEACE
AND
PAKISTAN

THE
ROAD TO PEACE
AND
PAKISTAN

By

ZIAUDDIN AHMAD SULERI

SH. MUHAMMAD ASHRAF
KASHMIRI BAZAAR, LAHORE

Copyright:

Published by
Sh. Muhammad Ashraf
Kashmiri Bazaar, Lahore
and printed by
Sh. Muhammad Ahmad
at the Northern Army Press,
65 Railway Road, Lahore.

TO THE FUTURE
LAND OF ISLAM

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
---------	-----	-----	----

PART I

Chapter	I.	How to Keep Peace	...	1
..	II.	A Practical Alternative to World Federation	...	11
..	III.	An International Economic Organisation	...	26
..	IV.	Chances of Peace	...	40

PART II

..	V.	Demand of Pakistan : Its Justification	...	47
..	VI.	Implications of Pakistan	...	68
..	VII.	Implications of Pakistan	...	106
..	VIII.	Conclusion	...	112
Appendix	121

P R E F A C E

The War is fast coming to an end. The Bigs are already planning for peace. Measures are being discussed to prevent the rise of another Hitler, another Germany. But the down-trodden humanity is looking beyond the conclusion of the war, beyond the disposal of war criminals, beyond the signing of another Armistice. It is interested in its own fate. How is the common man to emerge from this global war? How are the slave countries and subject races to emerge from this world-wide conflagration—from this war which is being fought to make world safe for democracy? What will, for instance, be India's share in this democracy? And other countries of Asia, Africa and the world? To them all it is a question of how to recapture their soul.

Mr. Churchill is talking about a world organisation of Big Powers. So is Mr. Roosevelt—that is to say, another League of Nations' arrangement to perpetuate the hold of 'Haves' against 'Have-nots.' Certainly the common man, the

slave countries and the subject races can have no interest in monopolies of this sort. If it is democracy, it is for them too; otherwise they cannot enjoy the sight of ignominious opulence of others—they cannot stand it, not for long anyway. To-morrow's peace must be devised only in terms of common good.

But it is real world-wide organisation that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have in mind—just the kind intellectuals and political thinkers are pleading for—then it may be said that such an organisation is an impossibility. A world political organisation can born only of unity of thought. Have we achieved that? The point need not be argued. Chasms of deep differences separate one country from another. The League of Nations failed precisely for the reason it had no common purpose before it. So long we want in that common purpose, a world political organisation will remain an insuperable impracticability. We might as well not waste our energy in pursuing the will-o'-the-wisp.

It can be argued that Science has changed the face of the earth. It is no longer divided by ranges of high mountain and expanse of vast

oceans. Now it is *one*. True, it is one, but it is only physically so. There is no unity of thought on corresponding world-wide scale. And this absence of unity of thought makes world's physical unity only dangerous. For, now, nothing—not distances—can deter us from fighting anyone we choose. No country is too far away to be attacked, whether it is in the Pacific or Atlantic. Therefore world's physical unity—Science's greatest achievement—is only a challenge to the sincerity of purpose of world's leaders of today. And if they have not completely lost their conscience, Science's stupendous achievements can be put to good use. The purpose of this little book is to indicate how.

In our scheme of things, world political unity can only fit as the ultimate end. Immediate aims are twofold: In the economic sphere, we must have real internationalism. Being physically one, the world is now economically so interdependent, that any attempt at division in this sphere will spell disaster. An international economic organisation must, therefore, be forthwith constituted. In the political sphere, we ought to outgrow petty nationalism. Such a move is

slave countries and the subject races can have no interest in monopolies of this sort. If it is democracy, it is for them too : otherwise they cannot enjoy the sight of ignominious opulence of others -- they cannot stand it, not for long anyway. To-morrow's peace must be devised only in terms of common good.

But it is real world-wide organisation that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have in mind -- just the kind intellectuals and political thinkers are pleading for -- then it may be said that such an organisation is an impossibility. A world political organisation can born only of unity of thought. Have we achieved that ? The point need not be argued. Chasms of deep differences separate one country from another. The League of Nations failed precisely for the reason it had no common purpose behind it. So long we want in that common purpose, a world political

oceans. Now it is one. True, it is one, but it is only physically so. There is no unity of thought on corresponding world-wide scale. And this absence of unity of thought makes world's physical unity only dangerous. For, now, nothing—not distances—can deter us from fighting anyone we choose. No country is too far away to be attacked, whether it is in the Pacific or Atlantic. Therefore world's physical unity—Science's greatest achievement—is only a challenge to the sincerity of purpose of world's leaders of today. And if they have not completely lost their conscience, Science's stupendous achievements can be put to good use. The purpose of this little book is to indicate how.

In our scheme of things, world political unity can only fit as the ultimate end. Immediate aims are twofold: In the economic sphere, we must have real internationalism. Being physically one, the world is now economically so interdependent, that any attempt at division in this sphere will spell disaster. An international economic organisation must, therefore, be forthwith constituted. In the political sphere, we ought to outgrow petty nationalism. Such a move is

slave countries and the subject races can have no interest in monopolies of this sort. If it is democracy, it is for them too: otherwise they cannot enjoy the sight of ignominious opulence of others—they cannot stand it, not for long anyway. To-morrow's peace must be devised only in terms of common good.

But it is real world-wide organisation that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have in mind—just the kind intellectuals and political thinkers are pleading for—then it may be said that such an organisation is an impossibility. A world political organisation can born only of unity of thought. Have we achieved that? The point need not be argued. Chasms of deep difference separate one country from another. The League

oceans. Now it is *one*. True, it is one, but it is only physically so. There is no unity of thought on corresponding world-wide scale. And this absence of unity of thought makes world's physical unity only dangerous. For, now, nothing—not distances—can deter us from fighting anyone we choose. No country is too far away to be attacked, whether it is in the Pacific or Atlantic. Therefore world's physical unity—Science's greatest achievement—is only a challenge to the sincerity of purpose of world's leaders of today. And if they have not completely lost their conscience, Science's stupendous achievements can be put to good use. The purpose of this little book is to indicate how.

In our scheme of things, world political unity can only fit as the ultimate end. Immediate aims are twofold: In the economic sphere, we must have real internationalism: Being physically one, the world is now economically so interdependent, that any attempt at division in this sphere will spell disaster. An international economic organisation must, therefore, be forthwith constituted. In the political sphere, we ought to outgrow petty nationalism. Such a move is

slave countries and the subject races can have no interest in monopolies of this sort. If it is democracy, it is for them too; otherwise they cannot enjoy the sight of ignominious opulence of others -- they cannot stand it, not for long anyway. To-morrow's peace must be devised only in terms of common good.

But it is real world-wide organisation that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have in mind -- just the kind intellectuals and political thinkers are pleading for -- then it may be said that such an organisation is an impossibility. A world political organisation can born only of unity of thought. Have we achieved that? The point need not be argued. Chasms of deep difference separate our countries from another. The League of Nations failed precisely for the reason it had no common purpose before it. So long we want

oceans. Now it is *one*. True, it is one, but it is only physically so. There is no unity of thought on corresponding world-wide scale. And this absence of unity of thought makes world's physical unity only dangerous. For, now, nothing—not distances—can deter us from fighting anyone we choose. No country is too far away to be attacked, whether it is in the Pacific or Atlantic. Therefore world's physical unity—Science's greatest achievement—is only a challenge to the sincerity of purpose of world's leaders of today. And if they have not completely lost their conscience, Science's stupendous achievements can be put to good use. The purpose of this little book is to indicate how.

In our scheme of things, world political unity can only fit as the ultimate end. Immediate aims are twofold: In the economic sphere, we must have real internationalism: Being physically one, the world is now economically so interdependent, that any attempt at division in this sphere will spell disaster. An international economic organisation must, therefore, be forthwith constituted. In the political sphere, we ought to outgrow petty nationalism. Such a move is

already shaping out and *bloes* and combinations of countries have come into existence. These combinations are however the result of—excepting one or two—war contingencies and imperialist drives. Conflict and disintegration are inherent in their formation. To build up peace, we must have strong foundations. A world political organisation, I have contended, is not practicable cause of lack of common purpose, common ideology. Now this important factor, absent as it is in world-wide affairs, does certainly exist in world-divisions. Common ideology has welded the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. into a solid singleness. Common ideology can well make Anglo-Saxon co-operation a permanent reality. These combinations world has already seen. What I propose new—not really new—is the formation of an Islamic Federation, comprising the vast stretch of land from Turkey to the Punjab, receiving its life-blood from the common ideology of Islam. The e are just my illustration. This factor will surely operate in other regions, zones and combinations with equal force.

Formation of ideological combinations will effectively resolve the present chaos. Firstly, it

will avoid the farce of the League of Nations, which, in face of small and weak nations, will only be a monopoly of two or three Big Powers. Secondly, it will reduce the world into six or seven big *blocs*, more or less equal in power commanding mutual respect. It will do away with small countries—the veritable baits of all greedy aggressions—who, by joining *bloc* of their choice, will receive the status of the equal and along with them will go petty nationalisms. Thirdly, it will put premium on ideologies and thus help the formulation of world political thoughts, through which alone can the world really unite.

Thus common ideology is the sheet-anchor of the peace plan which I have ventured to envisage in this booklet. If on the one hand it concedes self-determination to India to remain within or go out of the British Empire, it also provides for the self-determination of Indian Musalmans in the North-East and North-West zones to separate and coalesce with Muslim countries outside India to consummate the formation of Islamic Federation.

Here is a test for the victors of to-morrow.

If they will have fought this war for democracy and freedom and not merely to hold what they have, they will let democracy work unchecked. Britain will not debar India from entering the domain of the Free. Similarly it will be up to Hindu India to show how much she is mature for freedom by not blocking the way of Musalmans to the goal of their own determination. Pakistan represents an ideology in ferment for self-expression. You can suppress Pakistan only at the price of suppressing freedom, progress and peace. Pakistan and world peace are one problem. *The Road to Peace and Pakistan* is the same.

Before I close, I should like to say that this book is only an effort to focus attention on a particular line of thought. It is not intended to be exhaustive in any of its aspects.

New Delhi.

Z. A. SULLERI.

CHAPTER I

HOW TO KEEP PEACE

Peace Preparations Now

Thinking minds all the world over now increasingly realise that just as war preparations started in the peace years of 1933-39 so should peace preparations start right now in the midst of the war. Tomorrow's peace problems should be tackled today so that the cessation of the war might bring us something more substantial than an armed truce.

The whip-lash of Wendell Willkie sounds the warning that "neither the proclamations of leaders nor the opinions of the people of the world, however articulate, can accomplish anything unless we gave our plans reality." Again he speaks: "The people must define their purposes during the war. I have quite deliberately tried to provoke discussion of those purposes among the peoples of the various countries of the world. For I live in a constant dread that this war may end before the peoples

of the world have come to a common understanding to what they fight for and what they hope for after the war is over. I was a soldier in the last war, and after that war was over, I saw our bright dreams disappear, our stirring slogans becoming the jests of the cynical, and all because the fighting peoples did not arrive at any common post-war purposes while they fought. It must be resolved to see that that does not happen again.”*

Discussing further the three courses open to the Americans to choose, namely, that of “narrow nationalism, which ultimately means the loss of our liberty; international imperialism, which means sacrifice of other nations’ liberty, or the creation of the world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation.” Willkie declares: “I am convinced the American people will choose, by overwhelming majority, the last of these courses; to make the choice effective we must win not only the war but also the peace, and we must start winning it now.”

**One World.*

Hammering the same point Louis Fischer says: "There are those who say, 'Why talk about the peace?' The answer is that politics cannot be confined in compartments of time. This war did not start on September 1, 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland. It started in 1931, when Japan invaded Manchuria, in 1935, when Mussolini attacked Abyssinia, in 1936, when Mussolini and Hitler intervened in Spain. Just as the war started during the peace, so the peace has started during the war. ' Some persons did not know that war had started during the peace and so they thought they were at peace and they thought they could stay out of the war. Many now allow themselves to believe that the peace will wait until after the Armistice. But they may suddenly discover that war-time arrangements with our Allies and war-time decisions for the disposition of our enemies in fact are the peace. The peace will be made during the war. "

These opinions should arouse the Allied leaders to think hard as to what they really propose doing for the post-war era of peace. If they are fighting to restore peace to the world they ought to think of means which will keep it

when it comes.

How to do ?

The question of world peace, however, is not answered by merely pointing out the necessity for worrying about peace. The moment we give such warnings, a big interrogation poses itself before us : How to do ? What to do ? That indeed is the question which warrants our concentrated attention. Willkie's idea is : " To win this peace three things seem to me necessary : first, we must plan now for peace on a world basis ; second, the world must be free, politically and economically for nations and for men, that peace may exist in it ; third, America must play an active, constructive part in freeing and keeping its peace." Further : " When I say that peace must be planned on a world basis, I mean quite literally that it must embrace the earth. Continents and oceans are, plainly, only parts of a whole, seen, as I have seen them, from the air. England and America are parts ; Russia and China, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, Iraq and Iran are also parts and it is inescapable that there can be no peace for any part of the world unless the foundations of peace are made secure."

One World

The world basis of peace is born of the realisation that physically and materially the world has become one. Distance has been annihilated. The very notion of space and time has been revolutionised by the terrific progress made in the means of covering distances of land, sea and in the air and the world-uniting devices like the Radio, Television and Telegraphs. In fact the progress of science has been so rapid that it would appear unnatural to compare the last war years with the present war times. "At the end of the last war not a single plane had flown across the Atlantic. Today that ocean is a mere ribbon, with aeroplanes making regular scheduled flights. The Pacific is a slightly wider ribbon in the ocean of the air, and Europe and Asia are at our door-steps."

World Federation

In face of this world-oneness it is no doubt impossible to devise means to secure peace on any other basis but world-wide. This encourages some to passionately plead for a world federation. "The world federation plan," says Mr. Ely

Culburtson in his book *Summary of the World Federation Plan*, "in spite of its new approach and great scope has a remarkably good chance of being adopted." Similarly an Indian Political Party resolution solemnly declares that "in the future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a world federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation of one nation over another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the pooling of world resources for the common good of all." The resolution expresses the hope that "on the establishment of such a world federation, disarmament would be practicable in all countries, national armies, navies, and air forces would no longer be necessary and a world federal defence force would keep the world peace to prevent aggression."

Impracticable

We contend that the idea to establish a

world federation is premature. The physical oneness of the world makes us forget that elimination of space and time can make peace possible but not inevitable. Robert M. Hutchins, writing in the American magazine *Fortune* on the possibility of a durable society rightly remarks: "Since important divisions among men are not those of space and time, they are not eliminated by the elimination of space and time . . . The shrinkage of the world therefore cannot usher in the brotherhood of man: it can only accelerate the clash of antithetical ideal. Unless man can and should have common ideals, that the natural moral law underlies the diversity, that the good, the true and the beautiful are the same for all men, no world civilisation is possible." If we look deep into the 'causes of the League of Nations' failure, we shall find it was not due to any other factor so much as to the lack of a common ideal. The collaboration among the nations in the League was mechanic, legalistic, not emotional and passionate. It was not born of any desire to fight for and die for any common ideal. That is why the League of Nations never took any bold decisions when

Culburtson in his book *Summary of the World Federation Plan*, "in spite of its new approach and great scope has a remarkably good chance of being adopted." Similarly an Indian Political Party resolution solemnly declares that "in the future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a world federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation of one nation over another, the protection of national minorities, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the pooling of world resources for the common good of all." The resolution expresses the hope that "on the establishment of such a world federation, disarmament would be practicable in all countries, national armies, navies, and air forces would no longer be necessary and a world federal defence force would keep the world peace to prevent aggression."

Impracticable

We contend that the idea to establish a

world federation is premature. The physical oneness of the world makes us forget that elimination of space and time can make peace possible but not inevitable. Robert M. Hutchins, writing in the American magazine *Fortune* on the possibility of a durable society rightly remarks: "Since important divisions among men are not those of space and time, they are not eliminated by the elimination of space and time . . . The shrinkage of the world therefore cannot usher in the brotherhood of man; it can only accelerate the clash of antithetical ideal. Unless man can and should have common ideals, that the natural moral law underlies the diversity, that the good, the true and the beautiful are the same for all men, no world civilisation is possible." If we look deep into the causes of the League of Nations' failure, we shall find it was not due to any other factor so much as to the lack of a common ideal. The collaboration among the nations in the League was mechanic, legalistic, not emotional and passionate. It was not born of any desire to fight for and die for any common ideal. That is why the League of Nations never took any bold decisions when

critical moments called for them, lest the farce of co-operation be exposed. All it did in its twenty years of existence was to contribute richly to the popularity of Swiss Hotels where the boredom of its morbid deliberations could somewhat be relieved. "The League of Nations," says Willkie, "was half-blown: and men and women having no joint purpose, except to defeat a common enemy, fell into capricious arguments about its structural forms." At best it was "an Anglo-French-American solution, retaining the old colonial imperialisms under new and fancy terms."

Need of a Common Ideology

Thus the question we have to answer before any kind of talk about a world federation can be intelligible is whether we have agreed upon a common ideal to pursue. We have not to wait for an answer. The deep and obvious differences that cut one country and one people apart from the other are extremely discouraging. Indeed, in the present anarchic world conditions and destructive centrifugal tendencies betrayed by national spokesmen, by their acts and their utterances, he should be very bold man who

affirms : " Yes, we have agreed upon a common ideal." But his will be a lone voice. Until the people of the world as a whole do not passionately desire a world federation, any talk about it is species of wishful thinking. That we have achieved the physical unity of the world cannot be gainsaid, but emotionally and ideologically, we remain split as ever. It is like a household whose members do not agree amongst themselves, though its geographical unity cannot be denied.

Thus the world political unity, however we wish it to be built, cannot be built like a pyramid from the top. Realism demands we rather concentrated on educating world opinion on some definite code of principles till the time comes when their acceptability arouses a spontaneous demand for their translation into practical shape from all the parts of the world and produces a band of leaders whose honour can be trusted. Such a demand for world federation will inevitably involve the surrender of national sovereignty. That is all the more reason why before that stage is reached all the nations concerned should know and agree

that the object is worth the sacrifice of their sovereignty. To achieve that willing and conscious co-operation, the thick clouds of distrust that darken the sky now should first be dispelled. For, as it is, even a clear enunciation of principles is not possible, leave alone raising the structure of the world federation. The world federation is not round the corner. We have to grope a long way for it. Just now we have to be content with something short of it.

CHAPTER II

A PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVE TO WORLD FEDERATION

What Next

Our contention that political world unity is not practicable today is forced on our consciousness by the stark realities that stare us in the face. Like realists we have to accept our situation, but that is not to say that we are to remain stationary and maintain the *status quo*. We have got to go ahead of our present-day country patriotism. The circumstances which forbid world unity *politically* impel us to discard our narrow nationalism.

Now what is the position we can take ahead? The answer is easily indicated by what has already begun taking place in the shape of combinations—the Anglo-Saxon combination, for instance. Realising that the era of small countries in isolation is over, combination of different countries and nations have begun to

form. Here, then, is the next step we can take ahead. Only we have to be sure as to the basis of these combinations. Will it be geographical, ideological or merely imperial?

If we examine the British-U.S. relationship we find that it is the ideological basis which sustains it. The United States helped Britain in the first year of war and later on entered with the professed aim of defending the Western civilisation and democracy. Geographically the United States is as much connected with the Pacific as with the Atlantic. Rather the trade and imperial interests primarily lie in the Pacific. A friendly Japan would be useful. But her repeated alliance with Britain shows beyond doubt that it is the common way of life that brings them together. Again China and Japan are closely situated geographically. Not only that. Racially too, they come of the same stock. But these racial and geographical bonds have failed to tie them together in this war. What is the reason? The reason obviously is ideological; they are not the same in the pursuit of an ideal. It is the strength of their ideological difference with Japan that makes it easy for the

Chinese people to collaborate with the far-flung continent of America. Nor have cultural bonds and geographical nearness between the British and German peoples made them allies.

Ideological Federation

This analysis is fundamental to our thesis, in that it indicates the basis on which we suggest combinations should form. If it is a democratic axiom that peoples should have the right to choose their own form of government, it inevitably follows that different countries and nations should have the right to join federations and combinations of their own *choice*. That which will determine this choice, we maintain, is a common ideology. Speaking of the united front put up by the Dominions, Wickham Steed has uttered a profound truth. He writes: "... The London Conference attests the value of voluntary *cohesion among nations inspired by similar ideals*. This cohesion is the fruit of the method of freedom not of compulsion or constraint." We earnestly affirm that it is the "cohesion among nations inspired by similar ideals" wherein lies the peace and tranquillity of the world. Any combination which lacks that *kind* of

cohesion will be artificial and doomed. That is why it is necessary now that combinations are forming that utmost care must be taken to ensure that only "nations inspired by similar ideals" are brought together, or that nothing is done to keep them apart. Conversely speaking, no effort should be made to bring together nations pursuing *dissimilar* ideals.

"Spontaneous and voluntary cohesion" can only be born of common ideology. The key to world political unity lies in first achieving large combinational unity on ideological basis. Only unity in narrower spheres can lead to wider unity. There can be no peace on a world basis if the very foundations of prospective constituent units or combinations are insecure. The principle of ideology holds good in restricted country spheres as much as in a wider world order. Clash of antithetical ideologies can as easily occur in a district or province as in great combinations at large. Therefore, if we really want to avoid precarious peace, formation of solid combinations on ideological ground is imperative. Maybe, we do not achieve world political unity *now*, but by forming combinations

on secure ideological ground and thus extirpating divisions from within these combinations, we shall have facilitated the way of posterity to achieve the end we just cannot reach. That will be our contribution.

Combinations can also derive strength from geographical closeness, but it is too precarious a ground to be entirely relied upon. Neighbours can be the worst fighters, inasmuch as, being near, it is the easiest to fly to each other's throat. But geographical nearness or remoteness is now a relative term. Distances are no longer prohibitive. And this world-wide geographical oneness can become a great ally of common ideology in forming natural combinations which will grow and quicken our consciousness for the ultimate world unity.

Parenthetically we might explain what we mean by ideology. When we speak of an ideology we do not refer to anything fixed for all. An ideology is something that impels an emotional urge to attain it and the process that so starts unites those who hold it in common. It can be different for different peoples.

Thus our next step is to form ideological

combinations. Such combinations can easily spring to existence if ideological affinities are allowed to work their way unhindered.

Break-up of Present Combinations

This line of thought boldly envisages the break-up of certain present-day unnatural combinations, forged as they are by foreign imperial agencies. A case in point is India. If after the cessation of the war India is given the right of self-determination, as it is solemnly promised by British statesmen, she may not on ideological considerations choose to remain within the British Commonwealth. On the other hand, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa may. All that depends on whether ideological considerations make for retaining the present structure of the British Commonwealth or not.

From it follows another result. Today India is one. It owes its unity not so much to geography or at all to common ideology but to the British Administrative Authority. But when we are talking of freedom we are essentially talking of freedom of free choice of alliance. The hundred million Musalmans assert that they are a different people which on ideological

grounds is true. And as such they demand the right of self-determination to form their own state in the area where they preponderate. According to our theory it must be forthwith conceded. In case this demand is not conceded now we venture to say it will be postponed only for so long as a strong Central force can keep Muslims down. The moment they muster enough strength to break this artificial bond asunder it will be rent asunder.

Prospective Ideological Federations

In the light of the above discussion now let us piece together nations and countries which can be knit into the fabric of natural ideological combinations, or have taken steps towards that end. We shall examine them here only with a view to illustrating our idea in the concrete and it is not an attempt at preparing a comprehensive scheme for delimiting the world into ideological combinations. Here we merely plead for consideration of a line of thought which we believe is conducive to the peace of the world and practical. Once the idea is accepted details can be worked out, with greater accuracy.

To our mind three such combinations appear not only practical but already half-formed. These are : (a) Anglo-Saxon with such Western democracies as France, Belgium, Denmark, Norway and others as well as Dominions like Canada to coalesce. (b) The U.S.S.R. with such Eastern European States as Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia and others to join. (c) The Islamic Federation consisting of Turkey, Arabia, Middle East States, Iran, Afghanistan and such parts as Muslims in India claim to be the area of Pakistan and other Muslim areas.

Anglo-Saxon

(a) The Anglo-Saxon combination is natural. As the author (an American) of *Only An Ocean Between* emphasising the relationship between the two nations says : " We speak the same language : good British blood flows in American veins ; we are essentially the same peace-loving people ; we are both striving toward democracy ; we are both passionately attached to freedom and individual liberty." This makes the British and American ways of life and their civilisation approximately the same. What is

more, their material interests, as has been abundantly made clear in the two World Wars, are identical. Emphasising this aspect of their kinship the well-known American diplomat writer Walter Lippmann, in his remarkable book *The U. S. Foreign Policy*, argues for a close Anglo-American relationship; their very existence, he points out, depends on that. All this makes us sure that the Anglo-Saxon combination is destined to grow and prosper. It is in realisation of this fact that the great Anglo-Indian newspaper, *Statesman*, has suggested a common citizenship for the nationals of both these countries on the line Churchill offered it to France in 1941. This is further affirmed by Mr. Stettinius after returning to Washington from Britain where he had prolonged discussions with the British Ministers on what Wickham Steed describes as the "framework of peace". He describes the attitude of both the countries in the striking phrase that the United States and Britain will "stick together through thick and thin." We set much store by this declaration. The British-U.S. Federation is fast becoming a reality.

U.S.S.R.

(b) The case of the U.S.S.R. combination need not detain us for long. It is already an accomplished fact. The sixteen republics are joined together by their common Communistic ideology. The recent amendment in the U.S.S.R. constitution, conceding to the constituent republics the right to control defence and foreign relationship in the midst of this terrible war only speaks for the indissoluble bonds which bind them together in the comity of nations known as the U.S.S.R. Also there is the likelihood of the U.S.S.R. further expanding not necessarily because more Eastern and Mid-European States might be joining its federation but by the process of freely entering into alliance with her in a manner which may render them a part and parcel of the big organic whole of Communism. This in view of the aforementioned amendment in the constitution is not an improbability. Thus the U.S.S.R. combination is not only an obviously natural combination but to a great extent already an established fact.

Islamic Federation

(c) Now we come to the Islamic Federation. This combination, it can be asserted, has not yet shown any clear sign of its growing relationship among its members themselves. This is surprising because of all the three natural combinations this by virtue of the unifying influence of Islam is the most natural. It can, however, be easily understood why it has not sprung to existence. The reason is that this big Islamic region is kept asunder by foreign interests. In fact it were these interests which brought about the disintegration of this otherwise ideological and geographical whole.

Pan-Islamism

Pan-Islamism has been the dread of everybody for long. Such a fear is untenable now. Circumstances have compelled the formation of large combinations. No single country dare stand alone. All are agreed on it. Only our point is that these combinations cannot hold together if they comprise heterogeneous elements; to endure they must belong to the same ideological grouping. On this ground the Near East-Middle East-Iran-Afghanistan-Pakistan region

is the most natural combination. Once the controlling hand of alien interests is withdrawn, these Islamic countries are bound to come together. That is the only way the Islamic ideology can be preserved to operate.

This grouping together of Islamic countries should not, however, mean the revival of a strong central Caliphate. The constituent units of combination should enjoy the completest autonomy. The combination can easily be modelled on U.S.S.R. pattern, the federating units enjoying all the rights of the U.S.S.R. republics. The common bond will be the common purpose of pursuing and working out the principles of Islam.

Two Reasons

Those who have so far thought in terms of Islam *versus* Christianity should revise their attitude for two good reasons. First, no one can deny that Islamic ideology has enriched human experience and knowledge and furthered its progress and so it must be the common desire of all to allow its enlightening influence the fullest play. This attitude will help to avoid the conflict which is bound to occur sometime

if the protagonists of Islam feel that their aspiration to see the Islamic principles operate meets constant opposition. Muslims have an intense faith in the practical humanitarian influence of Islam and it will be wise to reckon with their wishes. As realism has forced the opponents of the U.S.S.R. to revise their attitude to it, it is not too much to hope a similar enlightened attitude will be adopted towards Islam.

The second reason is that a strong Islamic Federation will have a stabilising influence on all the surrounding powers. If the region remains weak, as it is today, the increasing stature, strength and influence of the U.S.S.R. will be impossible to resist. The result of such an eventuality will be that the international balance of power will be upset. This is not to oppose Communism which has done undoubted good to the two hundred million of peoples who were eking out their miserable existence under their Czars. But the notions of alleviating the lot of down-trodden humanity are different in Islam. (Of the *difference* we shall have occasion briefly to refer in a later chapter.)

is the most natural combination. Once the controlling hand of alien interests is withdrawn, these Islamic countries are bound to come together. That is the only way the Islamic ideology can be preserved to operate.

This grouping together of Islamic countries should not, however, mean the revival of a strong central Caliphate. The constituent units of combination should enjoy the completest autonomy. The combination can easily be modelled on U.S.S.R. pattern, the federating units enjoying all the rights of the U.S.S.R. republics. The common bond will be the common purpose of pursuing and working out the principles of Islam.

Two Reasons

Those who have so far thought in terms of Islam *versus* Christianity should revise their attitude for two good reasons. First, no one can deny that Islamic ideology has enriched human experience and knowledge and furthered its progress and so it must be the common desire of all to allow its enlightening influence the fullest play. This attitude will help to avoid the conflict which is bound to occur sometime

If the protagonists of Islam feel that their aspiration to see the Islamic principles operate meets constant opposition. Muslims have an intense faith in the practical humanitarian influence of Islam and it will be wise to reckon with their wishes. As realism has forced the opponents of the U.S.S.R. to revise their attitude to it, it is not too much to hope a similar enlightened attitude will be adopted towards Islam.

The second reason is that a strong Islamic federation will have a stabilising influence on all the surrounding powers. If the region remains weak, as it is today, the increasing stature, strength and influence of the U.S.S.R. will be impossible to resist. The result of such an eventuality will be that the international balance of power will be upset. This is not to oppose Communism which has done undoubted good to the two hundred million of people who were eking out their miserable existence under their Czars. But the notions of alleviating the lot of down-trodden humanity are different in Islam. (Of the *difference we shall later examine* briefly to refer in a later chapter.

So long as millions upon millions of Muslims passionately believe in the principles of Islam, the good that Communism has done cannot blind them to their faith that Islam gives real lead in the formation of individual character, solution of social and economic problems and the evolution of a classless society. This faith will impel them to resist all influences which encroach upon Islam, and undermine the solidarity of its followers.

The view that Islamic principles heal human ills does not mean that Islam is already presiding over the destinies of Muslims and they are leading their life according to its behests. In fact the reason that Muslims cannot act upon its principles serves as the motive force for their desire to free themselves of their present bondage for only then will they be able to instal Islam in its rightful place. This they cannot achieve merely by winning their freedom severally in their respective geographical spheres. To achieve this end, they are conscious, they have got to come together. As rightly pointed out by an authority on Communism that it could work its way to success, primarily because it had for its

operation the vast stretch of Russia. Similarly, Musalmans of this vast Islamic Federation have to join hands to achieve their object. This fact should particularly be taken note of by Indian Musalmans who demand Pakistan. If they really mean to stand for the ideology of Islam, and enforce it in everyday life, they have to work not only for their freedom but also for the freedom of all the surrounding Islamic countries.

Muslims' Destiny

Thus Pan-Islamism—there need be no shame in using this term—is the destiny of Musalmans. It can be achieved after freedom is achieved which in its turn will unleash the pent-up energy of the Muslim world to work for the common aim of enforcing the life-giving principles of Islam in this soulless and disintegrating world.

The formation of the Islamic Federation will leave India *minus* Pakistan, that is with about a population of three hundred and twenty million. This tract of land will be a good match for the Islamic Federation on the one hand and China on the other and will be competent to form a block of its own with like-minded partners.

CHAPTER III

AN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORGANISATION

Second Step

The second step that we can take ahead of our present position is to recognise the undeniable material and physical unity of the world which challenges us to find the solution of our economic problems on a world basis.

Economic Problem As it is—British

One way to look at our economic problem is this: England must export for her existence. That she can do only if she enjoys unrestricted trade rights in certain markets. Lord Keynes, the English economist and a Director of the Bank of England, said: "After this war, England must increase her exports 50 per cent. over 1938. There are no ifs about this. Otherwise England is sunk." This clearly argues for resistance against the freedom of countries which are under the British control. On December 12, 1930, Winston Churchill warned the British people in so many words:

“The loss of India would mark and consummate the downfall of British Empire. That great organism would pass at a stroke out of life into history. From such a catastrophe there would be no recovery.” Again in March, 1931, he raised the alarm: “The loss of India would be final and fatal to us. It could not fail to be part of process that would reduce us to the scale of a minor power.”

These views assume great significance when we consider that the Dominions are becoming more and more industrialised. Not only that. They are also becoming ever more conscious of the limitation which their connection with the Empire imposes on their expansion internationally. Already we mark unmistakable signs of agitation among the Dominion statesmen against British statesmen's attempt to further strengthen the Commonwealth bond; which can only mean that the Dominions will not be free to form the world contacts they are inclined to establish, such as Canada with America and Australia with China and other Pacific countries.

Mackenzie King, the Canadian Prime

Minister, openly resented Lord Halifax's speech in which he suggested exclusive Commonwealth partnership. He said Canada respected Commonwealth relations but that could not mean she should not be free to establish relationship wherever it suited her most. His latest declaration in the Parliament in London that "I am firmly convinced that the way to maintain the unity of the Commonwealth is to base that upon principles which can be extended to all nations. We should be false to the freedom for which we are fighting if, at any time, we failed to remember that no nation liveth unto itself and that nations great and small are members of one another... Our first duty is to win the war, but to win the war we must keep the vision of a better future..." has heartened an Indian newspaper to remark that "Mr. Mackenzie King represents the revolt against these old imperialistic conceptions which are directly responsible for the world's present ills."

Speaking for the Australian position we have Robert Menzies, ex-Premier of Australia's reasoned analysis: "In the Pacific we have

primary responsibilities and primary risks. Close as our consultation with Great Britain is, and must be, in relation to European affairs, it is still true to say that we must, to a large extent, be guided by her knowledge and affected by her decisions. The problems of the Pacific are different. Little given as I am to encouraging the exaggerated ideal of Dominion independence and separatism which exist in some minds, I have become convinced that in the Pacific Australia must regard herself as a principal providing herself with her own information and maintaining her own diplomatic contacts with foreign Powers. I do not mean by this that we must act in the Pacific as if we were a completely separate power; we must of course act as an integral part of the British Empire. We must have full consultation and co-operation with Great Britain, South Africa, New Zealand and Canada. But all these consultations must be on the basis that the primary risk in the Pacific is borne by New Zealand and ourselves. With this in mind I look forward to the day when we will have a concern of Pacific Powers, pacific in both senses of the

word. This means *increased diplomatic contact between ourselves and the United States, China and Japan; to say nothing of the Netherlands, East Indies and other countries which fringe the Pacific.*"

Thus from the British point of view, as so bluntly put by Winston Churchill, India alone holds out the hope of absorbing Britain's exports and for that India must remain under Britain:

American

Again America is making increasing claims for world markets, and raw material resources. Her capitalism is faced with stagnation. Discussing America's problem of capital, an Australian editor has the following frank remarks to offer :

"America is by no means as free of imperial ambition as the contented isolationism of her people or the anti-British imperialism of some of her leaders might induce the native observers to believe. Much American criticism of the British Empire—though of course not all—comes from those who would like to be exploiting for themselves some of the rich lands where British capital has got in first. That so far these ambitions have not stirred in the masses of

Americans is due largely to the fact that they still regard the United States as a country of boundless, unexploited opportunity. They are content to enjoy, behind barriers to immigration and competitive trade, the usufruct which has poured out so abundantly since the middle of the nineteenth century. Why go I looking for new lands to conquer? But the crisis of American capital springs from, or is exaggerated by, the fact that one of the conditions which created that usufruct—a rapidly expanding home market—no longer exists.” Hence the quest for new markets. Now this quest for markets is bound to involve the diminution of the British sphere of influence. The British cannot refuse U.S.A. the opportunities she demands for the expansion of her (American) capital for the simple reason that good relations between two are not only the corollary of their present and past alliance but also because the future of these nations depends on their mutual goodwill.

Russian

Also we have to take into account the position of the U.S.S.R. Mr. Willkie says: “Russia will be reckoned with. This is the

industry is only able to supply the needs of one person in a thousand. Out of one thousand only one person goes with shoes on. Now if that is the position, where is the room for stagnation of capital? How can ever the race for markets be fast enough to cause confusion, chaos and competition? The problem is not only to provide shoes for the remaining 999. It does not end there. With the rise in the standard of living no one can be content with one shoe. He will ask for more. Also for a variety and for other articles. So if the captains of the world industry are bold and imaginative and not tied down to the old grooves of thinking there is no economic problem whatever. Instead the real problem is how to feed, clothe and shoe the entire population of the world and extirpate epidemics that swallow millions upon millions of human beings. Thus the cut-throat competition, resultant from our present outlook, will change into an ideal adventurism. To achieve this noble end we will not only require business acumen but a missionary spirit to alleviate the sufferings of mankind. There is a thin line between exploitations and service of humanity. All depends on how we look at things.

World Economic Order

Assuming we are determined to restore and maintain peace of the world, we have to discard the view that enough markets are not available, that we can have trade only if we have closed markets, even at the cost of other people's liberty. If we want to avoid anarchy and revolution we simply have to discard this narrow view and begin thinking right now in terms of an international economic order. Towards that end an international economic organisation must be brought into being with the object to pool world resources to meet the needs of the entire people inhabiting this earth.

To achieve this objective this organisation will have—this is essentially a tentative enumeration of functions—(a) to speed up present world productive capacity, (b) to undertake exchange and distribution of world raw material, (c) to undertake the industrialisation of the unindustrialised parts of the different federations according to their potentialities, (d) to undertake the development of agriculture in the different parts of the different federations according to their potentialities, (e) to undertake exploitation

of other economic resources, and (*f*) to undertake distribution and exchange of foodgrains and foodstuffs.

Such an economic organisation can easily relieve the obsession for markets and world economy can pursue its course on healthy lines without friction. There is yet another hope. Once set to work the sphere of this economic organisation cannot be confined to economics only. It will make far greater alliance amongst the peoples of the different federations in spheres which are not strictly economic. Willkie says, ". . . Political internationalism without economic internationalism is house built on sand." Willkie obviously believes that political world unity is possible, only it must be supported by economic unity. Our belief is that while, as it is, world political unity is not possible, economic internationalism as outlined above will inevitably lead us to political internationalism. This economic collaboration will necessitate co-ordination in defence system and foreign relationship—these are inseparable spheres—leading us on our way to the so much desired and dreamt-of world political unity.

Delusion of Self-sufficiency

Further this economic organisation, based as it will be on mutual help, will expose the delusion of self-sufficiency. No country, no federation, can stand alone today. A world-wide economic order is called for primarily for the reason that no region, small or big, is self-sufficient. Even the so long "completely" self-sufficient U.S.A. no longer pretends to be so self-sufficient. This factor of self-insufficiency is most important and we should fully grasp its implications. Our entire society and daily life is woven round this fact of self-insufficiency, this healthy interdependence. It is only the arrogant, the tyrannical and the domineering who denounces it and regards himself above assistance. Such a man or nation who clamours for self-sufficiency or aims at self-sufficiency is a mischief-monger—mankind's enemy No. 1. Thus self-insufficiency, being so true to life, if worked out in the international sphere in mutual co-operation can easily resolve world's present anarchic conditions. In fact if we realise the far-reaching effect of this *fact* in life, we shall be agreed that in self-insufficiency lies the only hope of world

brotherhood. We have only to resolve to put this inherent *defect* to good purpose.

A Testimony

Just as we wind up our discussion urging the establishment of an international economic organisation we receive the following news supporting our views: "Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the U.S. War Production Board, told the Commission on Inter-American Development that 'in our own interests' the United States must help other countries develop their industries in an orderly manner after the war.

"What I have seen in the past few years has convinced me that a great change is taking place in the outlook of the American people on world economics. The war has made us aware, as never before, that our own resources and raw materials are not unlimited. We see we must look to foreign sources for many materials. We see we must have dependable overseas markets if we are to maintain high production and full employment. Moreover, it is plain to all that the years of high tariffs and extreme economic nationalism which followed the last war led directly to world-wide misery and strife. Increas-

ingly, we recognise that unless we build a world economy on a basis of sound, expanding trade among nations, we must expect the next generation to reap another such harvest of wars as has come in our time.

“As a result of what we have learned, in my judgment, isolationism is rapidly ceasing to be a major issue in American life. The Good Neighbour policy itself is a clear sign of change. Our people know we must trade with other countries. There is no theory about this. There is no sentiment about it. It is plain business sense. It is becoming ever clearer that the best method whereby we can promote a sustained, healthy expansion of foreign trade is to aid undeveloped regions to build up sound industries of their own. I am convinced that one of the main keys to a protected, lasting peace is the attitude of the men who negotiate the world's economic agreements in the period ahead. Only an attitude of fairplay can succeed.” (U.S.O.W.I.)

CHAPTER IV

CHANCES OF PEACE

Chances of Peace

We should now deal with one important question: What guarantee is there that the ideological federations will not fight against each other and bring about the destruction of peace which they propose to build?

To answer this question we should first enquire into factors which cause war. Such factors are many but the principal are (a) clash of economic interests, (b) Big Powers' ambition for world domination, and (c) weakness of small powers.

Our plan to secure peace is bound up with the establishment of an international economic organisation which will not only adjust economic interests of various federations but also undertake to promote the material well-being of the entire human race. The present-day vast industrial resources, high speed of scientific progress and world's geographical oneness assure us success in

this field. Without this international economic organisation the peace we have in view through ideological federations cannot be achieved. But by setting it up we certainly eliminate this most important factor—economic—which leads to war.

The other two factors, namely, small powers' weakness and Big Powers' ambition to dominate the world,—these are removed directly the ideological federations are formed. Small powers cannot stand alone. And on an international organisation based on present foundations, these powers, because of their smallness, are bound to be ignored. Primary risk and primary responsibility being of the Big Powers, they rightly claim decision must also be theirs. It is preposterous to suggest that Luxemburg or Liechtenstein can be the equal of Great Britain, America or Russia or for that matter even of Poland, Belgium or Czechoslovakia. Thus the complaint which Mr. Harold Nicholson aired the other day in the House of Commons that small powers were not 'being treated with deference and respect' is pointless. The only way these small powers can securely exist and exercise the right of full self-expression is by joining federa-

tions of their choice, where they will not only enjoy superficial 'deference and respect' but command real, equal and honourable status—the exact opposite position of nonentity they occupy today in the international field. Not only that. Through their respective federations they can effectively influence international decisions. Federations can effectively transform the weakness of parts into strength of the whole.

As for the States which suffer from the overweening ambition to dominate the world, the moment small powers shed their precarious isolation and become part and parcel of strong federations, the ambition for domination will of itself disappear. It feeds on the weakness of others. If the prey is removed, hunters have nothing to sharpen their knife for.

Weakness of International Organisation

Vis-a-vis our plan for the establishment of international economic organisation after the formation of ideological federations, it can be asserted that if economics is the real bone of contention, it can be internationally organised even *now*, without going to the length and

trouble of creating ideological federations. This is a more practical way to amputate this sinew of war. Our contention is, it will not work. For any arrangement on the present basis will mean that it will be an arrangement arrived at merely between two or three Big Powers—Churchill is quite clear on this point—leaving smaller nations to accommodate or adjust themselves as best as they can within the system outlined by these three Big Powers. Such an arrangement can never be based on or aimed at the co-operation of all : it will clearly tantamount to the dictation 'of the three *jointly* instead of one or two *severally*. This will certainly not eliminate war. On the contrary, it will add to the bitterness of the 'have-nots' whose challenging voice is bound to be raised sometime hence—supposing meanwhile the agreement of the Three endures, which is doubtful. Thus the seeds of war could not be thrown on soil more fertile than the one intended to be laboriously manured by the international organisation of Churchill's dream.

Again, agreement among Big Powers implies that these Powers will continue to be constituted as before. Churchill clearly says :

“There must be room within world organisation for an organism like the British Empire and Commonwealth.” We have attacked the very basis of present combinations, for they are unnatural. They are not composed of willing partners. This unwilling and forced partnership contains the deadliest germs of future wars. Our plea for the formation of ideological federations is with the aim to form willing partnerships on the basis of as large a number of people of fundamentally the same way of thinking in as large a territory as we can demarcate. Exterminations of divisions within will lead to peace without. Ignoring this fundamental consideration no international economic organisation can secure peace.

Prospects for Small Powers

An important result of ideological federations will be that the number of those who would participate in international deliberations will be reduced, say, to six from eight, all of them more or less equal in strength numerically and territorially. These federations will have equal responsibility in the maintenance of peace—unlike the present lopsided arrangement of Big

and Small and will be in a much happier position to devise and enforce plans for the material advancement of the world as also for its political unity. Equality will breed confidence and respect. Elimination of superiority complex, so palpable in the Big Powers of today, is the first step to genuine international co-operation.

Thus, though we cannot assert that ideological federations will outroot all factors of war, they have a far greater chance to maintain and promote peace than any other international arrangement based on the 'co-operation' of Big and Small, for the three reasons: that (a) there will be peace within federations because their constituent units will be willing partners, and (b) they will be small in number and so easily amenable to each other's point of view and almost equal in strength; and (c) there will be no small power in isolation to be intimidated or annexed. A reasonably secure peace is all we can at present visualise this system will bestow upon though undeniably the plan contains the seeds of greater and closer international understanding and co-operation ultimately leading to last world unity.

PART II

“We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitude and ambitions. In short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation.”—
(Qaid-e-Azam to Mr. Gandhi.)

CHAPTER V

DEMAND OF PAKISTAN: ITS JUSTIFICATION

The Alternative

In the foregoing pages we have envisaged the formation of ideological federations and the establishment of an international economic organisation. We have argued that these steps, which we can now take, will lead us on our way to world political unity.

Notwithstanding our earnest belief in the efficacy of this plan for world peace, we cannot be blind to the forces of vested interests which shall oppose all plans in the least calculated to minimise their importance. Thus chances of our plan's acceptance are small indeed. This realisation makes it necessary for us to visualise possible results if conditions in different parts of the world are let to remain as they exist today. We, however, propose to restrict our enquiry in this respect only to Indian Muslims.

Indian Muslims

We have advocated the formation of an Islamic Federation on the ground that the strong bond of Islam knits this vast stretch of land from Turkey to the Punjab, ideologically, in a single organic whole. This would mean that compact Muslim areas in India will seek separation from Hindu India to consummate integration with their natural partners in the Muslim States. Now we are considering the alternative : that is, we are trying to determine Indian Muslims' attitude in the event of the proposed Islamic Federation not forming. It need not detain us long to define their attitude. Because that which urges them to wish form an Islamic Federation works on inexorably to more immediate ends if the final is not yet to be realised. The attitude of Indian Musalmans is reflected in the demand of Pakistan, *i.e.*, separation form Hindu India. If they cannot just now join an Islamic Federation, they can at least separate and live their Islamic life in an independent country. That is the only way, Musalmans maintain, they can (a) avoid absorption in Hindudom and (b) work for the

enforcement of Islamic principles, be it on a small scale.

We have thus drifted to the question of Pakistan, that is to say, travelling as we are on the road to peace and Pakistan we have reached our next halting station. It will be our business now to examine the reasons for and implications of the demand of Pakistan at some length.

Pakistan : Bases of the Demand

Pakistan enfolds two points: it enfolds (a) the compact* areas wherein Musalmans preponderate and want to have them as their independent homelands, and (b) their urge to work out the Islamic principles in practice and live their life under the atmosphere created by their operation.

*The Punjab, Sind, North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan in the north-west of India with a Muslim population of about 26 million—this does not include Kashmir which has a Muslim population of 3,07,400.

In the North-East, Eastern Bengal and Muslim Assam have a Muslim population of 34 million, excluding those Muslims who live in Hindu Bengal and Hindu Assam. That is to say, about 60 million Muslims will become independent of Hindu control.

The figures do not include non-Muslim minorities.

Three main reasons have contributed to the formulation of this demand. These are : (1) Since Muslims were the rulers of India before the British advent, that governance of the country should be restored to them in at least the areas where they form the majority ; (2) Hindu and Muslim philosophies of life are so antagonistic to each other that it is impossible for them to live together. Such a thing can happen only if one accepts the permanent overlordship of the other. Musalmans are not prepared to be ruled by Hindus ; (3) Muslim impact with Western thoughts has given birth to a strong sense of realisation that mankind needs Islam which can alone solve its economic and social problems and give it spiritual satisfaction of mind. And the only way that mankind can be shown the way to Islam is to reduce its principles to the actuality of operation. This they hope to realise in Pakistan. Such an eventuality, it is their conviction, will lead to the liberation of Musalmans and the rest of the mankind from the misery of present chaos.

We shall now consider these reasons in some detail.

(1) Historical Reason

When the British came to India for trading purposes Musalmans were the rulers of the land. With the disintegration of their empire, British became the rulers of the country. But Musalmans were not reconciled to the foreign rule. Throughout this period of 200 years they have remained opposed to accepting foreign culture built on the ruination of their own. It is only as recently as Sir Syed Ahmed's time that they started learning English, though even now a section of Musalmans led by Mullas frowns upon English education and all that it stands for. This Muslim revolt against the British domination is well described in William Hunter's well-known book, *Our Indian Musalmans*, written as long ago as 1871 with the significant sub-title: "Are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen?" Unlike the Hindus, who welcomed the British,* the

* "We are slipping back into the position of India 200 years ago, when we called upon and welcomed the British to liberate us."—Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, quoted by DeWitte Mackenzie (an American journalist) in his book: *The Indian Problem can be Solved*.

Musalmans never ceased looking forward to the day when the British would withdraw from this country, for on that day, they hoped, they would be able to come into their own. That meant they would revert to the pre-British days of their rule, even if that rule was to be confined to territories wherein they preponderate;—which territories even according to modern democratic notions belonged to them. That is the historical reason why Musalmans demand Pakistan.

(2) Hindu-Muslim Differences

Much has been written about Hindu-Muslim disagreements. All such analyses have, however, been invariably concerned with details and manifestations such as riot, etc., rather than the understanding of the fundamental reason wherefrom these manifestations proceed. For instance, those who have tried to show that the two peoples are different from each other have only touched such matters as language, dress or the effects of the varying Indian climate. On the other hand those who have tried to establish the point of oneness of the two peoples have deduced their preconceived conclusion from

those very facts of dress, language and geography while the fact is that similarity in language and dress in the same region is immaterial. The difference that counts is that of behaviour, way of life and outlook on life. Hindu-Muslim differences are not born of dress or language ; they are fundamentally due to the clash between Hindu and Muslim ideologies. This clash in ideologies works itself out in daily life. Hindus worship idols, Musalmans owe allegiance to one God ; Hindus believe in castes, Muslims repudiate them ; Hindus flourish on interest, Muslims want to abolish it. What is more : this clash in ideologies has not yet worked itself to its logical extent because of the British rule in India. Were we to attempt at painting pictures of their life according to their respective notions of life when they will be free from the British control, the difference between the two pictures would be no whit less bewildering than the distance that separates the North Pole from the South. Thus the argument that Hindus and Muslims have lived together for so long is specious, in that they have not had the liberty to live up to their antithetical ideals. This

superficial unity will be breached the moment British depart. It is in this light that the Hindus desire to maintain the unity enforced by the British arms even after their withdrawal is construed by Musalmans as the naked Hindu ambition to rule over them. This the Muslims are resolved shall never be.

Having said this, we can easily pass on to the most important of all reasons which motivates Musalmans to demand Pakistan so passionately.

(3) Intellectual and Ideological Reason

The third reason which impels Musalmans to claim their homelands for themselves without any external political influence is born of their impact with modern thoughts and times. Musalmans have been deeply impressed by the amazing speed of scientific progress: they have watched the rise of capitalism and they have seen Communism emerge through a revolution in Russia. They also heard the shrill and persistent cry which scientific progress and social upheavals gave rise in the West, namely, "Religion has no place in the progress of mankind. It is an old institution which has outgrown its utility completely."

Muslim Reaction to Westernism

Through the British—the principal harbinger of Western civilisation in the East—Muslims received these thoughts and reacted sharply. They could not shut out from hearing the loud cry that religion was no longer any use. Muslim reaction, however, crystallised in two different shapes. One section—the common run of people—took it as yet another clever British ruse to further tighten their chains of slavery. Their hostility to British rule came to their rescue. It made them cling still more tenaciously to their religion. In this attitude they received ample reinforcement from their ignorant conservatism. Rebels against Western thoughts and modern learning, religion was their only refuge.

Is Islam a Religion ?

Reaction from the other section of Muslims was totally different. This reaction emanated from the intelligentsia who were thoroughly conversant with Western learning and fully aware of its trends. When they heard the cry that ‘ Religion was no longer any use ; it had nothing to do with the daily active life of man ’ they did

not run away from it ; they listened to it. It turned them introspective. It invited them to study Islam : “ Is it really so that Islam can no longer guide us in our modern life ? ” What they discovered in answer to their study and enquiry was what the West meant by the term ‘ religion ’ was not the contents of Islam ; indeed the term religion as understood in the West was altogether inapplicable to Islam. If by religion the West intended to convey the idea that it was an institution which claimed to promote private relationship between man and God and had nothing to do with man’s daily active life, they were sure, Islam was not a religion. For Islam did guide them in every branch of life. It embodied a code of principles for life—not details indeed, which must be worked out in the light of continuously changing circumstances—but ceiling or target principles under whose genus lay the entire fabric of their economic, social and spiritual life.

Socialism and Islam

Their examination of Western movements further convinced them that none of the ultra-modern movements was balanced ; their aim was

just good life in the sense of its being financially secure, at the most a luxurious life. Communism was merely a revolt against the Capitalist system of economics, which itself was a peculiar economic system. What Socialism aimed at was that men might "escape from the struggle of life to the doing of those things which are worth doing for their own sake". Socialism did not visualise what those things "worth doing for their own sake" exactly were beyond that that an individual will have the liberty of "making beautiful things because they are beautiful, the doing of right things because they are right" and enjoy other elements of good life such as "a certain level of physical and mental culture, an elevation of taste and a refinement of manners". Thus in effect Socialism merely aimed at "securing by the action of the central democratic authority a better distribution and, in due subordination thereto, a better production of wealth than now prevails." But this did not ensure even a happy life according to Socialists' own conception of a happy life. For the new economic system has brought in its trail new kinds of miseries and new kinds of evils which people living under the older c

consider worse than what Socialism sought to remove.

Distrust of Man

Another defect which they discovered to be inherent in Socialism was that it did not take into account the real factor of all trouble. Many methods are advocated to achieve its end. Evolutionary Socialists would have the prevalent system of government adapt itself to the Socialist system to change through a general strike. Communists—the most successful so far—believe Socialism can come through a revolution—through the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the base of this demand for change is the distrust of the present system. But this distrust does not end with the change from Capitalism to Socialism. All schools of Socialism are agreed upon devolution of power. Syndicalists are suspicious of State, so are Guild Socialists. Communists say that Russia is only in a transitory stage towards Socialism. Climax of this all-pervading distrust is reached in the Anarchists' theory of *no State at all*, because they believe that "the exercise of power over other men inevitably corrupts the best intentioned

natures. It makes them selfish, arrogant and oppressive, seekers after their own ends and neglectful of the interests of those who place them in power." They would much rather have voluntary associations formed *ad hoc* for the carrying out of special purpose.

This all-embracing distrust of systems, associations and States really means the distrust of man who is behind them all. If this distrust does not end with the change from Capitalism to Socialism, it is because the governing factor, the man, remains unchanged. It means further that no system, however perfect, can ever work to its desired goal and liberate mankind from its sufferings. Human nature will simply not let it succeed. Nevertheless Socialism remains deliberately oblivious of this fundamental defect and is supremely content with being suspicious. The question naturally arises: If man cannot be good, where is the good of having a good system? Man's vested interests will invariably prevent it. The dictatorship of the proletariat will not lead to a classlessness of society Socialism envisages; it will stay a dictatorship.

Islam's Objective

It is here that Islam makes the real difference. Islam primarily addresses itself to Man. The first thing it sets itself to do is to revolutionise his mind. At the same time it gives him direction. This direction pertains to all aspects of his life—economic, spiritual, moral and social—and establishes correlation between them. This revolution of mind gives Man an attitude to life which makes him righteous and courageous for their own sake. It is this revolution of mind which Islam primarily counts on bringing about a voluntary, natural, all the same revolutionary, classlessness of society. To Islam a system of life is essential but the cultivation of correct attitude of mind is primary.

Man has no doubt very complex problems to face, perhaps never more so than now. But he is competent to solve them. In fact the more complex the problem, the greater and fuller he emerges from solving it. What, however, will qualify him to solve his problems is not more brains but, as Islam insists on, the will to solve them, the disposition and attitude to solve them. Intellect is merely the handmaid of will. So long, therefore, as man is wanting in

that will and that attitude, not even our most ingenious and scientific methods will solve our problems and produce that concord and love among the people of the world which is the aim of true civilisation. For, however perfect in design and detail a system might be, unless and until the man who is entrusted to work it is not disposed to do his job honestly, the theoretically perfect system will never produce the desired result. There will be numberless loopholes for him to provide his escape from all the rules laid down for his guidance. Or the system itself will become so ruthless and tyrannical that 'liquidation' will be its only method to deal with any manner of difference of opinion—honest or otherwise. Conversely speaking, if man is honest and has the correct attitude to life, he will be able to produce results conducive to the well-being of people even out of a theoretically imperfect system of government. Thus even an autocratic king, if he possesses the correct disposition, is capable of real service to his people, whatever we may have to say against the institution of kingship.

Islam does not stand for a revolution—though its aims and results are always ultra-

revolutionary—but for the cultivation of mind, simultaneous with the enforcement of its peculiarly evolutionary system of life—economically and socially—one helping in the development of the other. The working of Islamic system might well be compared to the working of a fly-wheel of a bicycle which is set in motion by one jerk of foot and then goes on giving momentum to and receiving momentum from the foot. The whole process is so simultaneous that it renders cause and effect almost indistinguishable. Establishment of love and concord among the peoples of the world is the peculiar fruit of Islamic system which, though it looks like an end itself, is, in terms of Islamic ideal, merely a means towards a higher end.

Where Islam and Socialism Agree

Summarising our comparative study of Socialism and Islam, it may be said that Islam is in agreement with Socialism in so far as it aims at securing men a life free from material cares and to that end Islam outlines a specific economic system, but primarily it puts before men the ideal for the pursuit of which their freedom from the cares of life is imperative.

Therefore, the structure of society, which Musalmans will raise in pursuit of their Islamic ideal, will be different from that which Socialism proposes to build or has built in Russia. It is, however, conceivable that so far as the effort to make men free from the material cares of life goes, it may under both the systems be similar in many aspects. But there is all the difference in the world between a building intended to be housed by a bar or dramatic society and a building to accommodate judges' courts, though, in respect of building material, labour and engineering skill, both have the same requirements.

The ideal of Islam is the fullest development of man, mentally and spiritually, so that they might become acquainted with the very directive force behind Nature. This is no vague assertion. Islam clearly envisages a system of life which will enable man to rise to the highest pitch of excellence, mentally and spiritually, as definitely as it ensures his freedom from the material cares of life. It is not within the scope of this discussion to dilate on this point at any length. Here we content ourselves with its bare statement.

Real Basis of Pakistan

It is therefore this renewed faith in Islam that has whetted the enthusiasm of Muslim intelligentsia—and so the masses—to demand independent homelands for themselves so that the Islamic principles might be enforced there unhindered. This new vision has been given to Musalmans by Iqbal. Thoroughly aware of Western learning and leanings, their merits and demerits, he felt the supreme necessity of reconstructing Islamic thought in modern times and has eminently done so in his forceful poems, so that now the entire Muslim intelligentsia who demands Pakistan with the view we have analysed above is inspired by Iqbal. Anyone, therefore, who wishes to gauge Muslim feelings today must acquire the acquaintance of Iqbal.

In the foregoing discussion we have explained the three reasons which have awakened the Musalmans to a consciousness of their distinct individuality and the distinct role which Islam calls on them to play. In this light the demand of Pakistan is not for the sake of installing Musalmans in sovereignty in opposition to Hindus, but installing Islam in its rightful place

so that the world might witness the manifestations of its principles in operation. The urge to achieve Pakistan is indeed the urge to lead world thoughts.

This exposition of Pakistan clarifies the point why Musalmans are reluctant to remain within a united India. A united India cannot answer their urge to realise Islamic mode in life. To Musalmans independence can only mean that they have the incontrovertible right to reconstruct an Islamic society. This, obviously, they can only do in their independent homelands. Pakistan does not at all represent enmity towards Hindus, but the intense and positive Muslim desire to lead world thoughts on Islamic lines by actually living up to its principles. The Muslim role in modern times has been clearly indicated. And now in the attitude of Indian Musalmans is reflected their line of action. In the words of Iqbal :

ہے جنوں اتیرا نیا پیدا نیا ویرانہ کر

You have a new mission in life, come,
Create a new world of your own !

Writing about this role of Indian Musalmans in his book the *Future of Islam*, as long ago as 1882, W. S. Blunt says :


“India holds the first rank in the Haj, and all things concerned, is the most important land where Mohammedan faith is found. In the days of its greatness the Mogul Empire was second to no State in Islam, and though its political power is in abeyance, the religion itself is by no means in decay. India has probably a closer connection at the present moment (1880) with Mecca than any other country, and *it is looked upon by many there as the Musalman land of tomorrow. Indeed, it may safely be affirmed that the course of events in India will determine more than anything else the destiny of Mohammedanism in the immediate future of this and the next generation.*”

Muslims' Question to British

Pakistan today represents the long overdue renaissance in Muslim thought. That renaissance now on the eve of the heralded British departure from India is in ferment and the anxious question that Musalmans put to the British is this: Now that you are withdrawing from India, why should you force a united India on us? Why should you compel us to live under Hindu Raj? Why can't you leave Hindus to live their own life and Muslims to live their own?

Why the privilege to fashion life according to their light be conceded to Hindus and denied to Musalmans? A united India means that the hundred million Musalmans will be tied to the chariot wheel of Hindudom. Pakistan means both will be free in their respective spheres.

Considering all aspects of the question there is no escape from the conclusion that even if our plan for the building up of the Islamic Federation is resisted, what cannot be resisted with impunity is the hundred million Muslims' determination to achieve Pakistan. Our plea is that this overpowering consciousness of Indian Musalmans to play their distinct role in the world of tomorrow be recognised and reckoned with. The issue cannot for long be postponed.



CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS OF PAKISTAN

The Muslim demand of Pakistan has provoked some objections from the British and Hindus. Firstly, both insist that geographically India is one; secondly, economically Pakistan will not be self-sufficient; thirdly, its defence will be poor.

Geographical Objection

Hindu insistence on a united India is partly sentimental. That sentimentality ignores consideration of the sentiments of Musalmans. The British insistence on the geographical unity ("Geographically India is one," Lord Linlithgow and, "You can't alter geography," Lord Wavell) is not because they really believe geography is sacrosanct, for if it were so, their world position—the sun never sets on the British Empire—would have been untenable. Their objection is mainly because a united India suits them better. That the north-west area—one of the two Muslim zones—is easily separable from the rest of India

is well argued by Dr. Ambedkar, the Schedule Caste Leader, in his *Thoughts on Pakistan*.

“How far is it open for the Hindus,” he writes, “to say that Northern India is part of Aryavarta? How far is it open to the Hindus to say because once it belonged to them, therefore it must remain for ever an integral part of India? Those who oppose separation and hold it to be the ‘historic sentiment’ arising out of an ancient fact that Northern India including Afghanistan was once part of India and that the people of that area were either Buddhists or Hindus, must be asked whether the events of the 762 years of incessant Muslim invasions, the object with which they were launched and methods adopted by these invaders to give effect to their object are to be treated as though they were matters of no account?”

“Apart from other consequences which have flowed from them, these invasions have in my opinion so profoundly altered the culture and character of these Northern areas, which it is now proposed to be included in a Pakistan, that there is not only no unity between that area and the rest of India but that *there is*

as a matter of fact a real antipathy between the two.

“The first consequence of the invasions was the breaking up of the unity of Northern India with the rest of India. After his conquest of Northern India Mahmud of Ghazni detached it from India and ruled it from Ghazni. When Mohammad Ghorî came in the field as a conqueror he again attached it to India and ruled it from Lahore and then from Delhi. Hakim, the brother of Akbar, detached Kabul and Kandhar from Northern India. Akbar attached it to Northern India. They remained attached until the death of Aurangzeb. They were again detached by Nadir Shah in 1738 and the whole of Northern India would have been severed from India had it not been for the check provided by rise of the Sikhs. *Northern India, therefore, has been like a waggon which can be coupled or uncoupled according to the circumstances of the moment.* If analogy is wanted the case of Alsac Lorraine could be cited. Alsac Lorraine was originally part of Germany like the rest of Switzerland and the Low Countries. It continued to be so till 1680, when it was taken by France

and incorporated into French territory. It belonged to France till 1871, when it was detached by Germany and made part of her territory. In 1918 it was again detached from Germany and made part of France. In 1940 it was detached from France and made part of Germany :

The separation of this north-west area from the rest of Hindu India is not therefore a geographical impossibility.

As for the separability of the other Muslim region—the north-east—it is enough to remember that partition of that area did actually take place under Lord Curzon not long ago. The heavens did not fall on that partition, though of course, the Hindu wrath had the better of the British wit and the partition was reversed.

Administrative Objection

Administratively, it is argued, that it will be very difficult to separate the economy of Pakistan from that of Hindustan. The two areas are so closely integrated. For instance, there is the problem of communications. To associate this objection with those who claim to be political

Europeans, will not be complimentary to them, but there it is. Now Europe has its problem of communications but no one has suggested on that account that the various nations of Europe should be levelled down to one pattern. Hitler was trying to solve this problem in his own fashion but the Allies intervened and are now fighting him away from that aim. The Allies have further committed themselves to the restoration of small nations to their pre-war status in Europe. Does that not mean the Allies have committed themselves to the perpetuation of the communications problem, born as it is of the co-existence of many nations in Europe?

There is another aspect of the question. If separation gives rise to administrative difficulty, more grave kind of difficulties will have to be met otherwise. For instance, the Muslim revolt against the Central authority, if it is imposed on them.

Then the question is : Which is the greater administrative difficulty ? To appoint a few scores of accountants to adjust Railway receipts, etc., between Pakistan and Hindustan or to have to quell the Muslim revolt against the Central

authority? Remember the Delhi League resolution which promised "strife and bloodshed" if any kind of federation was forced on Musalmans.)

Economical Objection

The objection most serious and weighty to be made out against the scheme of Pakistan is the economic insufficiency of these areas and deserves to be treated at some length.

We have already envisaged a world-wide economic organisation. That may not come about on exactly the same lines as we have outlined. But there is no denying the fact that so far as economics is concerned, like world geography, it has indivisibly become one and must be tackled as such. Any attempt to tick to different spheres of economy—British, Persian and American—will spell disaster. That is the shortest cut to war. So we presume that some kind of international economic organisation will be set up so that economic chaos and friction might be reduced to the minimum. As yet the economics of Pakistan is not solely the concern of Pakistan. (Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman U.S. War Production Board—*et al.*)

quoted in full in chapter III—says the United States “in our own interest” must help other countries develop their industries.) Indeed no part of the world now is self-sufficient and all of them need each other’s help. Why not Pakistan?

The objection that Pakistan is not an industrialised area can be briefly answered. It is none of its fault. It is the British who have been ruling it for the last two hundred years. Whatever deficiency there is, it is due to them. In fact, do not all Indians indict the British for not having helped India on her way to economic prosperity? Pakistan is the part of the same India which has suffered from the British want of will to industrialise her. Another point which clean slips critics’ minds when any particular country is held up—like a veritable criminal—as an industrialised country is that none of the countries were industrialised from the very dawn of creation—certainly not Britain, America or Germany or Russia. Industrialisation is a matter of recent history. It is only in the last fifty years that Japan has become industrialised; it is only the last twenty years which have enabled Russia to fight down successfully the

industrial might of German hordes. Therefore, absence of industry in any particular land today is not a permanent label of incapacity against it. So easily Pakistan can be tomorrow what it is not today—that is, industrialised. It is not doomed for ever because its past rulers were not painstaking enough to worry about its industry.

It would be, however, worth while here to briefly enquire into the industrial potentialities of this area. An interesting article appeared on the subject in a Muslim newspaper and we would like to reproduce it here in full. This article is an illuminating example of how Muslim minds are now engaged in practical questions of 'how and why' of the industrialisation of Pakistan.

"Economic stability and political strength of a nation," the writer of this article says, "is best judged from its industrial potentialities and agricultural possibilities. Industrialisation of a country is the surest path towards attainment of self-determination. With the political awakening of the Muslim nation and their aspirations to have their independent homelands in North-East and North-West of India, it is our duty to prepare ourselves in anticipation for the

quoted in full in chapter III—says the United States “in our own interest” must help other countries develop their industries.) Indeed no part of the world now is self-sufficient and all of them need each other’s help. Why not Pakistan?

The objection that Pakistan is not an industrialised area can be briefly answered. It is none of its fault. It is the British who have been ruling it for the last two hundred years. Whatever deficiency there is, it is due to them. In fact, do not all Indians indict the British for not having helped India on her way to economic prosperity? Pakistan is the part of the same India which has suffered from the British want of will to industrialise her. Another point which clean slips critics’ minds when any particular country is held up—like a veritable criminal—as an industrialised country is that none of the countries were industrialised from the very dawn of creation—certainly not Britain, America or Germany or Russia. Industrialisation is a matter of recent history. It is only in the last fifty years that Japan has become industrialised; it is only the last twenty years which have enabled Russia to fight down successfully the

industrial might of German hordes. Therefore, absence of industry in any particular land today is not a permanent label of incapacity against it. So easily Pakistan can be tomorrow what it is not today—that is, industrialised. It is not doomed for ever because its past rulers were not painstaking enough to worry about its industry.

It would be, however, worth while here to briefly enquire into the industrial potentialities of this area. An interesting article appeared on the subject in a Muslim newspaper and we would like to reproduce it here in full. This article is an illuminating example of how Muslim minds are now engaged in practical questions of 'how and why' of the industrialisation of Pakistan.

"Economic stability and political strength of a nation," the writer of this article says, "is best judged from its industrial potentialities and agricultural possibilities. Industrialisation of a country is the surest path towards attainment of self-determination. With the political awakening of the Muslim nation and their aspirations to have their independent homelands in North-East and North-West of India, it is our duty to prepare ourselves in anticipation for the

great task of nation-building. In order to be behind none in the race of industrialisation in the post-war era we will have to see that our raw materials and resources are fully utilised within the country and an active, well-directed research—scientific and technological, which is the basis of all industrial expansion—is carried on. For the development of industries in Pakistan and consideration of their future prospects due attention must also be paid to the initiative and skill of the people, raw material and power resources of the land, the capital forthcoming and the markets available.

“Each nation today has to depend much for its life upon its industry, industry depends on science, the progress of science depends on the number of men that work in each country and that number chiefly depends upon the education facilities provided in each country. So the first problem before us is to provide technical education to our youth, because if Pakistan has to progress industrially it will require much greater number of technical personnel, fully and adequately trained. Untrained and cheap labour has no dearth in the country. Muslim engineers

should feel the greatest pride in the calling of their profession for it may be said that it is the very basis, heart and soul, of industrial progress: Great potentialities of Pakistan areas await Muslim engineers for their fullest exploitation.

“The next important controlling factor in the industrialisation of a country is the availability of power resources. There are three important fuels: coal which is thought to be the basis of national welfare of an industrial country; petroleum, the accelerator of progress, and water-power which to this day is an unused annuity. From the stand-point of permanency water is the most desirable form of energy, since water-power is a function of solar radiation and topography which for the purpose of economic analysis may be considered permanent, but coal and petroleum when burnt are irretrievably lost. There are innumerable waterfalls in Pakistan areas which can be utilised in providing cheap and enormous amount of white coal. Moreover, in Bengal we have access to Raniganj coal—the finest coal-mine in India, while we have brown coal reserves in Punjab, Baluchistan and Assam. One of the greatest necessities of the present age

namely petroleum, is found in large quantities in Assam and Punjab, where it has been worked extensively. Sind and Baluchistan await future exploitation and it is estimated that these combined will not only meet the home demand of Pakistan but would enable us to export petroleum to Hindustan as well.

“Proximity of iron to power resource is favourable for the development of heavy industries. Approximately two tons of coal are required for melting one ton of iron, so in all iron and steel establishments it is always the iron that moves to source of power. It is not at all necessary that an industrial country should be possessing extensive iron ores, it is the power that is the governing factor. Highly industrialised and advanced countries like Italy and Japan stand testimony to this. Both these countries are devoid of iron yet rich in water-power, while in our case Bengal has Raniganj ores, Punjab too has undeveloped, inferior iron ores and Baluchistan has enormous chrome reserves. So analysing all the aspects of this problem we see that Pakistan is not an irremediable loss, in not possessing iron ores, we

can surely balance the import of pig iron through the development of agricultural, textile and chemical industries, cheap hydro-electric power being a constant asset to industrial strides.

Chemical industries have a great future in Pakistan: sulphur from Baluchistan and soft wood from the timber clad mountains have helped the development of match industry and still more expansion can be effected in this branch in times to come. Saltpetre which is used in manufacture of glass is found in great quantity in Punjab. Salt the basis of innumerable chemical industries is extensively quarried in Punjab and gypsum which is used in manufacture of cement and spirits is abundantly found in Punjab; Baluchistan, and N.-W.F.P. Other industrial minerals like chromite, limonite, buxite, Fuller's earth, and kaolin, etc., too are available in Pakistan. There are great prospects of lumber and paper industry in these areas. Carpentry and lumbering have already taken a firm footing in Punjab and Kashmir. With the expansion of dehydration of vegetables and development of vegetable-ghee, the demand for wood containers is bound to increase.

namely petroleum, is found in large quantities in Assam and Punjab, where it has been worked extensively. Sind and Baluchistan await future exploitation and it is estimated that these combined will not only meet the home demand of Pakistan but would enable us to export petroleum to Hindustan as well.

“Proximity of iron to power resource is favourable for the development of heavy industries. Approximately two tons of coal are required for melting one ton of iron, so in iron and steel establishments it is always the iron that moves to source of power. It is necessary that an industrial coun-

Muslim Banks and Assurance Companies, the creation of Muslim Limited concerns, the interest of the Muslims in engineering education and endeavours to provide facilities for the technical education, and above all, the preferential treatment of home-made products are healthy signs of awakening. More enthusiasm and still more vigorous strides in these branches are required to accelerate the wheel of the industrial progress of the Muslim nation.”*

Agricultural Potentialities

As for agriculture, the Pakistan area is already well known as the granary of India. With scientific development, it can bid fair to become one of the granaries of the world. That is a self-evident fact.

The crux of the Hindu opposition to Pakistan is that Hindu “industrial, commercial and banking interests whose operation extend over the whole country” consider “tariff walls (which might be raised by Pakistanis) would be grave impediments.” That is how Dr. Beni Prasad has stated the real Hindu objection in

*Khatieb Masud Husain in *Dawn* of May 16, 1944.

his *Hindu-Muslim Question*. Hindus do not want "a field of gainful employment" be denied to them. But that is no reason why Musalmans should oblige them. On the contrary, the Muslims contend that the fullest economic development—industrial and agricultural—of Pakistan lies in its being in the hands of people who belong to it, that is, Musalmans. It should not be left to outsiders' imperialist intentions to draw on it in whatever manner it suits them.

The Positive Side

So far we have shown that economically Pakistan is not impossible. Now we shall proceed to argue that to grow and prosper to the full it is essential that the Pakistan economy should be separated from that of Hindu India.

To put it in a nutshell, Musalmans are opposed to a United India centre because they do not want the Hindus to succeed where Hitler has failed. Hitler wanted Germany to be the only industrialised centre in Europe, to make it Europe's mistress, to be surrounded by raw material producing vassal states.

The Pakistan zone has so far remained unindustrialised, partly because of the general policy that the British have pursued in the matter of industrialisation of India and partly because of the Hindus who have the capital to invest but would not invest it in the Muslim majority provinces. The reason for this attitude is that Hindus want industries to be concentrated in the Hindu majority areas of Bombay, United Provinces, Madras, etc. Pakistan is good enough to produce cheap cotton and other raw materials. If Lahore and Lyallpur were industrialised, the position of Ahmedabad and Cawnpore would be jeopardised. It is the result of this policy that the crores of rupees pouring in the P. M. zone are locked up in banks and are used only to extend the controlling hand over the provincial commerce. The extent of this control has gone so far that though almost the entire P. M. zone is a growing rural area under British rule, its markets are literally owned by Hindus. It was so that in 1942 when the Government of the Punjab—representing the interests of the Punjab—stated the plan of vision for the market committee stage -

markets in the whole province closed for over a month. The people living in the granary of India had to beg for their daily wheat supply. The defiance was so complete that the Government had to compromise.

A United India means that Musalmans will have to live in perpetual slavery to Hindu money-lenders, Hindu market-owners and Hindu industrialists. They refuse to be a willing victim of this Big Business conspiracy.

Again, the recent food crisis focussed everybody's attention on the high price of wheat. There was great agitation against it, because high wheat price meant profit for the Muslim wheat-growers of the Punjab. But no one remembered that for the last four and half years the Cawnpore, Ahmedabad and Bombay cloth was being sold at over 100 per cent. high profits which the Muslim wheat-grower had to buy. Not all the proceeds of the wheat sale went to the Muslim cultivator—the ubiquitous Hindu commission agent and merchant who really owns the markets gets a lion's share of all proceeds—but hundred per cent. of the fabulous wealth made out of cloth business straight went to the

Hindus. No wonder Hindu businessmen clamour for a united India. It suits them so well. So long as the Pakistan area remains under a Hindu Centre there is no hope of its ever becoming industrialised. The Hindu business magnates will see to it that it remains a raw material producing region for their mills in Cawnpore, Ahmedabad and Bombay.

Pakistan an Independent Economic Unit

On the contrary if the Pakistan economy be separated from Hindu India, it is bound to flourish in its independence. The potential economic self-sufficiency of this area is understandable when we consider a region of rivers, the Pakistan, can easily produce cheap electric energy and industrialise the whole countryside and help digging up the untold mineral wealth that lies buried in its soil.

If proofs are wanted they are not lacking. Professor Coupland in his latest book, the *Future of India*, has proposed economic instead of political demarcation of India. The natural division of India, he argues, for the purpose of economic development is by river basins. On a

markets in the whole province closed for over a month. The people living in the granary of India had to beg for their daily wheat supply. The defiance was so complete that the Government had to compromise.

A United India means that Musalmans will have to live in perpetual slavery to Hindu money-lenders, Hindu market-owners and Hindu industrialists. They refuse to be a willing victim of this Big Business conspiracy.

Again, the recent food crisis focussed everybody's attention on the high price of wheat. There was great agitation against it, because high wheat price meant profit for the Muslim wheat-growers of the Punjab. But no one remembered that for the last four and half years the Cawnpore, Ahmedabad and Bombay cloth was being sold at over 100 per cent. high profits which the Muslim wheat-grower had to buy. Not all the proceeds of the wheat sale went to the Muslim cultivator—the ubiquitous Hindu commission agent and merchant who really owns the markets gets a lion's share of all proceeds but hundred per cent. of the fabulous wealth made out of cloth business straight went to the

Hindus. No wonder Hindu businessmen clamour for a united India. It suits them so well. So long as the Pakistan area remains under a Hindu Centre there is no hope of its ever becoming industrialised. The Hindu business magnates will see to it that it remains a raw material producing region for their mills in Cawnpore, Ahmedabad and Bombay.

Pakistan an Independent Economic Unit

On the contrary if the Pakistan economy be separated from Hindu India, it is bound to flourish in its independence. The potential economic self-sufficiency of this area is understandable when we consider a region of rivers, the Pakistan, can easily produce cheap electric energy and industrialise the whole countryside and help digging up the untold mineral wealth that lies buried in its soil.

If proofs are wanted they are not lacking. Professor Coupland in his latest book, the *Future of India*, has proposed economic instead of political demarcation of India. The natural division of India, he argues, for the purpose of economic development is by river basins. On a

river-basin basis, the Professor has divided India into four regions, in two of which Hindus predominate and in two others Muslims. The two Muslim regions are the Indus basin and basin of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra between Bihar and the eastern frontier—the Delta. In support of his contention, the Professor cites the example of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States.

“A most impressive example,” he writes, “of what can be achieved by large-scale economic organisation has recently been afforded by the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States. The Tennessee River rises in the Alleghany Mountains and flows for about 900 miles till it joins the Ohio. Its basin covers an area of about 42,000 square miles and includes parts of seven States. The elevation of this area varies from near sea level to 6,000 feet, and its climate ranges widely between the sub-tropical and temperate zones. It possesses rich, undeveloped mineral resources, and it can grow almost all the crops that are grown anywhere on the continent between Canada and the Gulf of Mexico. Yet, ten years ago, the Tennessee basin

was notoriously backward. Its population was relatively small and its standard of living relatively low. There was little industrial development, and the predominantly agricultural community was not only losing its more enterprising members, who sought to better their lot elsewhere, but in its efforts to make a living it was fast destroying the means of making it. Burdened with large families their energy often sapped by malaria, their primitive methods of farming, they found themselves perilously near the margin of subsistence."

This grievous condition, Professor Coupland tells us, was remedied by establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority. "It should be charged," said President Roosevelt (1933) in a message to the Congress on its inauguration, "with the broadest duty of planning for the proper use, conservation and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin for the general, social and economic wealth of the nation."

The achievements of this project have been summarised as follows: "(1) The flow of the Tennessee River has been controlled by a syste

of dams and reservoirs, holding high water of the rainy season and releasing and 'stepping' them down the valley in dry weather. Nine major dams have been built across the river, and eleven minor ones on the tributaries. The reservoirs and lakes thus created cover an area of over 11,000 square miles. (2) A navigable channel at least nine feet deep is now available for water transport from Knoxville to the Ohio—a distance of 648 miles. (3) Power-stations have been installed at the dams, and the power is transmitted to public authorities, private companies and individuals over the whole area at a cheap rate. (4) The revival of agriculture and the prevention of erosion are combined in a long-term plan, covering the establishment of research institutions and demonstration farms, the manufacture of low-priced fertilisers, the restoration of forest or grass in areas unsuitable for arable cultivation, the checking of denudation by terracing, damming and planting, the introduction of new crops and the encouragement of dairying and livestock industries and of co-operative organisation, and so forth. (5) The incidence of malaria, which would

otherwise have been increased by the mosquito-breeding facilities of the new lakes and reservoirs, has begun to decline as the result of an organised preventive campaign. (6) National parks have been marked out for recreation and preservation of wild-life, and holiday centres organised at the lakes."

Within ten years the face of earth was completely changed. If it is in the hands of its own people, the same can undoubtedly happen to Pakistan. But not otherwise.

Professor Coupland finds further support for his contention that economic regional demarcation can solve India's political problem in the "interesting and original scheme of Regional delimitation conceived by a member of the Indian Civil Service (M. W. M. Yeats, C.I.E., Census Commissioner for India) whose responsibility for the decennial census of the Indian population has made him closely acquainted with the argument on which it is built."

Yeats delimits Northern India on river-basin basis into three regions and leaves South India—a "country of the Great Peninsula"—as the

of dams and reservoirs, holding high water of the rainy season and releasing and 'stepping' them down the valley in dry weather. Nine major dams have been built across the river, and eleven minor ones on the tributaries. The reservoirs and lakes thus created cover an area of over 11,000 square miles. (2) A navigable channel at least nine feet deep is now available for water transport from Knoxville to the Ohio---a distance of 648 miles. (3) Power-stations have been installed at the dams, and the power is transmitted to public authorities, private companies and individuals over the whole area at a cheap rate. (4) The revival of agriculture and the prevention of erosion are combined in a long-term plan, covering the establishment of research institutions and demonstration farms, the manufacture of low-priced fertilisers, the restoration of forest or grass in areas unsuitable for arable cultivation, the checking of denudation by terracing, damming and planting, the introduction of new crops and the encouragement of dairying and livestock industries and of co-operative organisation, and so forth. 5. The incidence of malaria, which would

otherwise have been increased by the mosquito-breeding facilities of the new lakes and reservoirs. has begun to decline as the result of an organised preventive campaign. (6) National parks have been marked out for recreation and preservation of wild-life, and holiday centres organised at the lakes."

Within ten years the face of earth was completely changed. If it is in the hands of its own people, the same can undoubtedly happen to Pakistan. But not otherwise.

Professor Coupland finds further support for his contention that economic regional demarcation can solve India's political problem in the "interesting and original scheme of Regional delimitation conceived by a member of the Indian Civil Service (M. W. M. Yeats, C.I.E., Census Commissioner for India) whose responsibility for the decennial census of the Indian population has made him closely acquainted with the argument on which it is built."

Yeats delimits Northern India on river-basin basis into three regions and leaves a "country of the Great Peninsula"

fourth region. The three regions in the Northern India are: “(i) the Indus basin, stretching from Kashmir to Karachi (corresponding in political terms to Pakistan); (ii) the basin of the Ganges and the Jamna between the Punjab and Bengal (corresponding to Hindustan); (iii) the basin of the Ganges basin and the Brahmaputra between Bihar and the eastern frontier (corresponding to North-East India).”

Yeats argues that “regional division by river-basins *corresponds with economic needs*. Most of present-day India lives on its rivers. Many millions of its people depend directly, and many more indirectly, on irrigation; and the possibilities of economic welfare for India largely depends on the proper use of its vast water-power. Hydro-electric installations will not only facilitate industrial development; they will benefit the great majority of the population which must always gain its living from the soil. Cheap electricity can do more than anything else to improve the work and welfare of the Indian villager. It would enable him to increase the productivity of his land and to widen the scope of his efforts and interests, while develop-

ments in electrical refrigeration would expand the market for his produce."

We draw the pointed attention of our readers to Yeats' following observation: "The full utilisation of the rivers demands a long-range plan which cannot be carried out within the separate areas or with the separate resources of provinces. The area of the plan, like that of the Tennessee Authority Valley, roughly corresponds with the area of the river-basin. The Indus and its tributaries serve Kashmir, the North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab and Sind. The proper utilisation of these waters is a vital common interest of them all."

The above discussion conclusively proves that the contention that economically Pakistan will be hopelessly weak is totally wrong and baseless. Rather looking at the economics of Pakistan, with the background, firstly, that the people who cherish the goal of Pakistan so passionately will not rest content until they have done all and given their best to make their homeland prosperous and happy, and secondly, the international co-operation must come forth tomorrow not only in

interest of the undeveloped region concerned but equally in the interest of peace, progress and civilisation of the world, it is not at all a fantasy to say that within ten years the area of Pakistan will have undergone as revolutionary a change as the Tennessee River Basin has in the United States.

Sind's Example

That Pakistan in separation will flourish beyond our present estimate can be further illustrated by the example of Sind. The province has been able to pay back the huge debt of 24 crores which it owed to the Centre on account of the Sukkur Barrage within eight years of its separation from Bombay and seven years of provincial autonomy, although Sir Otto Niemeyer anticipated that it would take at least 40 years to pay it off. "Sind," it is the claim of its present Revenue Minister, Khan Bahadur M. A. Khano, "is no longer a deficit province. . . . It has a bright future, and, although a small province, the construction of the Upper and Lower Sind Barrage, which are intended to be taken in hand soon after

the termination of war, and, it is expected, be completed in about 10 years' time, *will be one of the richest provinces.* Almost all the land that is fit to be cultivated will be used, and this will bring in general prosperity of the province."

This is a true picture of the future of Pakistan. But to remain hitched on to the star of Hindu India is suicidal for the economy of Pakistan. The alternative to Pakistan will be an unrelieved Hindu economic domination.

Bombay Plan

The aims of Hindu capitalism have now further crystallised in the so-called much publicised Bombay Plan. It is the child of the Birla-Tata combine. It has further accentuated Muslim opposition to a Hindu United India. The plan answers the worst fears which Muslims have for long entertained. It visualises a "temporary eclipse of individual liberty and freedom of enterprise." We put it to the British and Congress politicians who swear by the utmost autonomy and residuary powers for provinces whether autonomy fits in this picture

of an absolute authoritarian control—for long the dream of Big Hindu Business?

Commenting on the Plan, the London *Economist* says: "... The plan's political implications are plain enough. Its authors themselves envisage rigorous Government control of practically every aspect of economic life, temporary eclipse of individual liberty and freedom of enterprise and they postulate a central directing authority enjoying sufficient popular support and the requisite powers. If such a programme becomes the new Congress policy, the political question becomes whether national planning such as hitherto seen only in Germany and Russia is either possible in India or desired by Indians."

The *Economist* caps this analysis with the assertion: "The issue ceases to be one of national independence and democratic freedom—the nationalist's old slogan—and becomes one

"It is not a question of 'if'—It is the Congress policy. Congress and Big Business are identical. Here's what Louis Fischer has to say in his *100 Years With Congress*. Ask: 'What proportion of the Congress budget is covered by big India?'" Mr. Gandhi replied "Practically all of it."

of State planning of the most authoritarian kind." Provincial Autonomy indeed !

Further : " By increasing Indian industrialisation the war has increased the political strength of Indian industrialists who have some influence on the present Viceroy's Council where the old-style nationalist politicians of the Congress and the Muslim League by their own refusal have not. Suddenly it seems that Indian nationalism may aim not at some form of democracy fitted to India's peculiar needs and circumstances but State capitalism at a bound. The parallel of China where the fervent and popular nationalist movement has temporarily resulted in control of a financial dynasty with maladministration and acute economic difficulties among the masses of the people and a stout and wary Communist fringe is apt but not very encouraging."

For Musalmans it is not merely more saying that this is "not very encouraging". On the contrary, it is a matter of life and death for them. Capitalism is bad enough anywhere but the Bania Capitalism built on the ignorance of the teeming millions and supported by the so-called Nationalist

will be the worst fascism the world has ever seen. Muslims propose to resist it by whatever means that are available to them.

Clarification

One point, however, be made clear. Muslims are not opposed to planning as such. In fact, without some kind of planning Pakistan cannot make any headway to industrialisation and prosperity. The snag Muslims detect in any planning done from the heights of a United India Centre is that all such planning will reflect the mentality of Hindu *bania* majority. These Hindu plans will proceed—as you can see it from the Bombay Plan—from Hindu concept of economy and Hindu thought of finance. Muslim planning will be on a totally different basis. And with a Hindu Centre, Muslims can never be free to plan their economy according to their own lights. Anyone who asserts that it is possible, deceives Muslims in vain. If there can be no Capitalist Republic in a Communist Russia and if there can be no Communist State in the Capitalist United States, there can be no Islamic Pakistan under a Hindu United India.

Muslim Economics under Hindu Centre

The picture of Muslim economics under a Hindu India will be dismal indeed. Even under the present circumstances—which are bound to be aggravated under a United India tomorrow—the economic position of a Musalman is hopeless. He has to compete with a Hindu of totally different concept of life and practices in trade. For example, if a Hindu tradesman earns hundred rupees he is bound to save at least seventy of them. A similarly situated Muslim can save only about twenty. This progressively leads to the gulf which divides a Hindu tradesman controlling markets, from a Muslim entirely at his mercy. The only way a Muslim tradesman can compete with a Hindu is to beat him on his own grounds, that is to say, live miserly, accept interest and employ all other dirty tricks of the trade. In other words, a Muslim is obliged to bid good-bye to his innate notion of life and accept those of his Hindu competitor. Subjugation can mean nothing else.

It is pertinent here to refer to the Indians' position in South Africa. Much has been said about the Union Government's discrimination against Indians. There is no doubt that the

Union Government is motivated by racial considerations but we cannot ignore the economic factor. With their increasing population, their low standard of living and their genius for hoarding, Indians do constitute a threat to the European social life. The only way to meet the danger—since they are, unlike Indian Muslims, in authority—is the demarcation of zones and imposition of restriction on Indian expansion. We can—and should—legitimately object to white imperialism but we cannot coerce anyone to change their way of life and lower their standard of living.

Change of Present Economic System

Muslims do not ask for Pakistan merely to effect transference of authority from the British to Muslim hands, but primarily with a view to enforcing Islamic principles in this land which will first of all liberate Muslims from the tyranny of the present economic system. Under the present system Muslims have the choice of being either completely swept clean before the inundation of Hindu money or accept Hindus' own practice—manifestly anti-Islamic—to their complete moral ruin. In Paki-
tan

Musalmans will not be obliged to conform to other peoples' standard ; they shall instead set up a standard of their own. That standard of life, in its economic aspect, means death to all manners of hoarding and accumulation of wealth. Musalmans are bound to prosper under it, because it will govern the life of them all.

Pakistan holds out for Musalmans the only chance to reduce their ideals to actuality. Even the throne of India will not induce them to compromise in their stand. This is the Muslim mood today.

Summary

We might now summarise our discussion on the economic aspect of Pakistan as follows : (1) The economics of Pakistan—as no other country's—cannot be isolated from the rest of the world. Interdependence is the watch-word now. (2) If Pakistan has not been so far industrialised it is due to the British policy. Present unindustrialised state of the Pakistan areas cannot, therefore, be an argument for its incapacity for future industrialisation. (3) On the contrary, the industrial potentialities of Pakistan are immense. (4) Agriculturally, Pakistan is

already known as the granary of India. With scientific development it might well become the granary of the world. (5) The unindustrialised state of Pakistan is in no small measure due to Hindu business magnates' reluctance to industrialise Muslim regions. They want the industries to be entirely concentrated in their own areas. (6) Like Hitler, Hindus want to keep Pakistan areas as merely raw-material producing regions and so completely at their mercy. Under a Hindu Centre, Pakistan can never become industrialised. (7) Pakistan is an independent economic unit. Professor Coupland suggests that India be divided into four regions on economic basis - that is, on river-basin basis - two of which, namely, the Indus and Delta basins corresponding to the north-west and north-east Muslim zones, will be Muslim and two Hindu. Professor Coupland cites the forceful example of Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States as to how by means of construction of dams and production of cheap electric energy, the face of earth can be changed within a given period. Thus, the Professor and Yeat in his Regional Delimitation scheme say, fully applies to Pakistan areas and they can easily become prosperous

independent economic units. (8) The Bombay Plan fully brings out that Hindus aim at an "authoritarian" rule which envisages "eclipse of individual liberty and freedom of enterprise" and which while in its economic aspect means that economic planning of India will proceed from the Hindu business stand-point and for its benefit and so against Muslim interests, in its political aspect it means that there can be no room for any provincial autonomy. (9) Under a Hindu Centre—with plans like the Bombay one—Muslims will be obliged to live under the Hindu system of economics. Pakistan aims at liberating Musalmans from the very economic system that prevails today and substitute it by one conforming to Islamic notions of economic life. (10) And lastly, the all-round material progress of India lies in the decentralisation of economic command. Every zone must be free to develop as its peoples like it, because they alone have the best interests of that zone at heart and they alone can give the best of their efforts to its prosperity. Otherwise one zone will be the field of "gainful employment" for the people of the other zone, which in present circumstances means the dictatorship of Hindu business.

Unhindered by outside interests Pakistan will not take long to become happy and prosperous and even *economically* the envy of Hindustan. This, however, cannot be taken to mean that Pakistan will reject co-operation with Hindustan. Once free to fashion their own life, economically, politically and socially, Muslims will ask for—and give to—whatever help they can get from Hindu India and far beyond. Here again we emphatically state that no longer can the world economy be divided, if we want peace. But co-operation must be on respectable basis. Monopolies cannot be tolerated. On this point Muslims may be well-dependend on not to give in.

Defence Position of Pakistan

The question of defence of a country depends on two factors : its man-power and its economic position. But before we attempt an analysis of Pakistan's position in this respect, we would say that defence again is no longer an isolated question for different countries to solve. Like economics it must be tackled jointly. And we hope if economics is tackled jointly, the question of defence will be automatically solved.

On this point Louis Fischer's retort to a British General who asked him if a free India could defend herself was very apt. He answered : " But can a free England ? " Further elaborating his reply he said : " What nation now-a-days can defend itself single-handed ? Not England, nor France or Italy or Russia. If only those countries are without outside aid, there will be very few, if any, free countries. So that the General's question should have been whether after this war an international organisation will be set up which will defend free India and free France and free America and free England and free Rumania and all free countries against all aggressors. The mounting destructive power of armaments will make the future of all of us more and more depend on measures of international security. In the air age, national independence becomes merely synonymous with international collaboration for peace."

That is the whole truth. No country can stand alone now, economically or defensively. But if we were really to put the ability to defend itself against aggression as a qualification for independence, who can assert India can defend herself alone against aggression.

Unhindered by outside interests Pakistan will not take long to become happy and prosperous and even *economically* the envy of Hindustan. This, however, cannot be taken to mean that Pakistan will reject co-operation with Hindustan. Once free to fashion their own life, economically, politically and socially, Muslims will ask for—and give to—whatever help they can get from Hindu India and far beyond. Here again we emphatically state that no longer can the world economy be divided, if we want peace. But co-operation must be on respectable basis. Monopolies cannot be tolerated. On this point Muslims may be well-dependent on not to give in.

Defence Position of Pakistan

The question of defence of a country depends on two factors : its man-power and its economic position. But before we attempt an analysis of Pakistan's position in this respect, we would say that defence again is no longer an isolated question for different countries to solve. Like economics it must be tackled jointly. And we hope if economic is tackled jointly, the question of defence will be automatically solved.

On this point Louis Fischer's retort to a British General who asked him if a free India could defend herself was very apt. He answered : " But can a free England ? " Further elaborating his reply he said : " What nation now-a-days can defend itself single-handed ? Not England, nor France or Italy or Russia. If only those countries are without outside aid, there will be very few, if any, free countries. So that the General's question should have been whether after this war an international organisation will be set up which will defend free India and free France and free America and free England and free Rumania and all free countries against all aggressors. The mounting destructive power of armaments will make the future of all of us more and more depend on measures of international security. In the air age, national independence becomes merely synonymous with international collaboration for peace."

That is the whole truth. No country can stand alone now, economically or defensively. But if we were really to put the ability to defend itself against aggression as a qualification for independence, who can assert India can defend herself alone against all manners of aggression ?

It will further mean that all the countries which went down before the hordes of Hitler must be disqualified for independence. On that score not even Great Britain, nor even the mighty United States of America can lay any claim to independence. Let us therefore grasp the fact that the world today is interdependent. All will play their part, but jointly. And in such a world picture Pakistan is quite willing to occupy her rightful place.

Pakistan Stronger than Hindustan

But answering the objection raised in the jarring strain the Pakistan will not be able to do this and do that, it may with quiet confidence be asserted that defensively Pakistan will be better off than Hindustan for a variety of reasons. Enumerating some of them: (a) Pakistan will not have the North-West Frontier problem—a huge sum of money is expended on that account. It will be at peace with the neighbouring Muslim States. (b) Its man-power will not be wasted on defending the long stretches of Hindu India's coasts. (c) Its man-power will be in a class and in abundance. The famous Muslim soldiers the backbone of Indian Army will be available.

able to enter the service of Islam. (Hindustan will take some time to engender in its soldiers quite the same spirit that a Muslim displays on battle-fields.) That spirit is the result of centuries of tradition. And due to the permanent climatic conditions and other considerations it will be well-nigh impossible for Hindustan to produce the fine physical stature of Pakistani soldier; and (d) Pakistan's economy will be reasonably strong to equip its soldiers well.

To be sure Pakistan has nothing to fear on this score and may be counted upon to give a good account of itself when called upon to meet any aggression, an eventuality which can be—and must be—avoided if only world leaders join hands in hammering out an agreed policy.

Thus economically, defensively, and administratively there is nothing that makes Pakistan impracticable. On the contrary, it is a hard practical proposition and to Musalmans their destiny.

CHAPTER VII

Status of Muslim League

The demand of Pakistan is put forth by the All-India Muslim League on behalf of the Indian Musalmans. Hindu leadership, opposed to Pakistan, disputes the Muslim League's right to represent Musalmans and hopes by so doing to combat the scheme of Pakistan. It is therefore worth while to enquire into the status of the Muslim League.

The Muslim League claims that its programme for the attainment of Pakistan embodies the will of the people. The League's claim to represent the sentiments of Musalmans could have been contested some years ago when Pakistan was not adopted as its creed, but impartial observers can no longer doubt it now. Pakistan has made Muslim League the greatest tribune of Muslim voice since the fall of their Empire. The immense enthusiasm that the League has aroused among Muslims by its goal of Pakistan might well be said to reflect the fact that even those individual Musalmans who

do not on personal grounds join it, dare not come before the Muslim public with any programme other than the right of self-determination for Musalmans.

In the constitutional field, the Muslim League has captured almost all the by-elections in Muslim constituencies after the 1936 general elections for the Provincial Legislatures. Moreover all Muslim Ministers in the Muslim majority provinces believe in the creed of Pakistan.

But the most important and decisive step which the Muslim League has taken to vindicate its hold on the Musalmans is its clear announcement that on the issue of Pakistan it would abide by "the verdict of the Muslim plebiscite." Thus the opponents of Pakistan—British and Hindus—have only to arrange for a plebiscite to decide the issue finally. Nothing could be more honest and above board.

Boundaries of Pakistan

The demand of Pakistan raises two questions which Muslim League as the party which speaks for Musalmans has to answer. Firstly: What will be the geographical boundaries of Pakistan; the Muslim League lays its claim to territories wherein Muslims preponderate. It does not

hold the present provincial boundaries to be sacrosanct or unalterable. On this point League's Lahore Resolution—popularly known as the Pakistan Resolution—is quite clear. While asking for the geographically contiguous Muslim areas in the north-east and north-west to be grouped together to form independent Muslim States, it definitely subjects such a demarcation of areas to 'such territorial readjustments as may be necessary.' Thus the determination of the Pakistan boundaries is an open question which when the principle of Pakistan is conceded, can easily be entrusted to a Delimitation Commission.

Minorities in Pakistan

Secondly: What will be the position of non-Muslim minorities in the Pakistan? Here the Muslim League concedes the same right to non-Muslims in Pakistan which it asks for Muslim minorities in Hindustan. The same Lahore Resolution says: "That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in the constituent units and in the region for the protection of the religious, cultural,

economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India, where Muslims are in minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them."

Sikh Position

One point which is posed for clarification is the position of Sikhs. Sikhs claim to be a distinct people and as such consider themselves entitled to the right of self-determination. Now the right of self-determination requires two conditions to be fulfilled before it can be realised. That the people claiming it must be large enough in number and occupy large enough an area to be converted into independent states. Muslim demand for the right of self-determination is strong on the score of these very two points. Sikhs in the Punjab do not fulfil either of these conditions. They are not more than 14 per cent of the population—in many Hindu Provinces Muslims are more numerous than Sikhs

in the Punjab—nor are they in an absolute majority in any district of the Punjab. The right of self-determination cannot be claimed in disregard to these two conditions. Notwithstanding this, the President of the All-India Muslim League has given them the assurance that whatever measures Sikhs propose to ask for the protection of their culture would be taken.

Yet another important point may be clarified here. The demand of Pakistan is being made not primarily to solve Hindu-Muslim question but to give the Muslims their due. The separate nationhood demands separate statehood. Pakistan is primarily to achieve that end. But simultaneously the scheme circumscribes the present vast proportions of the Hindu-Muslim question, in that, it removes the very bone of contention, of who should rule whom. Once the Muslims get their Pakistan, Hindu-Muslim question will dwindle to the general question of minorities which confronts all the world over here. The minority question might well be entrusted to an international tribunal. The Muslim contention is that no doubt a minority in Hindustan they are a majority in Pakistan. A minority in Hindustan

they are ready to submit themselves to Hindu rule and abide by *the decisions* of international tribunal, if any constituted for the purpose, but in Pakistan they are the paramount nation and have the incontestable right to rule according to their light.

in the Punjab—nor are they in an absolute majority in any district of the Punjab. The right of self-determination cannot be claimed in disregard to these two conditions. Notwithstanding this, the President of the All-India Muslim League has given them the assurance that whatever measures Sikhs propose to ask for the protection of their culture would be taken.

Yet another important point may be clarified here. The demand of Pakistan is being made not primarily to solve Hindu-Muslim question but to give the Muslim their due, the separate nationhood demand separate nationhood. Pakistan is primarily to achieve that end. But simultaneously the scheme circumscribes the present vast proportion of the Hindu-Muslim question, in that, it removes the very bone of contention, of who should rule whom. Once the Muslim get their Pakistan, the Hindu-Muslim question will dwindle to the general question of minorities which concerns the world over free. The minorities of the world will be expected to be interested and bound. The Muslim question is not a purely Indian question. If India is to be a free and independent nation, it is bound to be a free and

they are ready to submit themselves to Hindu rule and abide by *the decisions* of international tribunal, if any constituted for the purpose, but in Pakistan they are the paramount nation and have the incontestable right to rule according to their light.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

British Declarations

We would conclude this book on a brief review of the present political situation.

On the commencement of the War, the British Government adopted the attitude that no constitutional change could be introduced in the midst of the war. On behalf of His Majesty's Government, the Viceroy of India made a declaration in August 1940 that "... it is clear that *the moment* when the Commonwealth is engaged in a struggle for existence is not one in which fundamental constitutional issues can be decisively resolved." This declaration was agreeable to the Muslim League which had already asked the British Government not to do anything in the midst of the war which would prejudice and prejudice the issue of Pakistan. The British Government were, however, prepared to "... readily consent to the setting up after the conclusion of the war with the least possible delay of a body representative of the principal

elements in India's national life in order to devise the framework of the new constitution." But this was subject to the condition that the British Government "... could not contemplate transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life. Nor could they be parties to the coercion of such elements into submission to such a government."

Thus the position was that (a) there could be no constitutional changes in the midst of the war, (b) a representative body would be set up to 'devise the framework of the new constitution' immediately after the war, and (c) such a constitution could not be forced on 'large and powerful elements in India's national life' without their willingness to accept it.

These declarations did not contemplate the acceptance of the Muslim League demand of Pakistan, but so far as they went not to 'prejudice and prejudice the issue of Pakistan' the Muslim League was well content not to press the demand during the war but fight for it "after the cessation of the war."

Breach of Trust

This position, however, did not last long. The 'truce' desired by the League and demanded by the British Government has been broken. The Congress propaganda on the one hand, and the British Government's desire to appease the Congress on the other, has made the British statesmen in Britain and India come out with declarations like 'Geographically India is one' and 'You can't alter geography'. This is to take up the position that a United India is the aim of the British Government. Thus unmistakably the Muslim League demand of Pakistan stands prejudiced and prejudged.

Such a position could not be tolerated by the Muslim League. And at its Delhi Session in 1934 it clearly expressed its fears that "the speeches and statements made by responsible British statesmen both in England and India lead to the conviction that not only the declaration as was asked for—acceptance of Pakistan—will not be forthcoming but that some kind of Federal Constitution is under contemplation."

Post-War Plans

Another aspect of the activities of the British

Government in Britain and India which not only deepens this suspicion but definitely outlines the British design for the future of India is the preparation of the so-called post-war plans. These plans cover the entire national life in matters such as economics, communications, education, and agriculture, etc. All these plans proceed from the assumption that a strong Centre will preside over their being worked out into concrete shapes.

For example, we take the Education Plan. This plan has already passed all the stages of drafting and approval (by the Reconstruction Sub-Committee of the Executive Council presided over by the Viceroy—its Deputy Chairman being the Mahasabha industrial magnate of the Birla-Tata school of thought, namely, Sir Jawala Prasad Srivastava).

This post-war education plan aims at the 'tightening of control over universities from the Centre.' It further contemplates the 'creation of an authority which could co-ordinate university education in the interest of the country as a whole.' This authority is to be constituted on the model of the Universities Grants Committee of the United Kingdom. Under it every pro-

vincial government will be required to consult before making any grant to a university for any substantial development. Mark the thin edge of the administrative and financial aspect of the plan with which we are at the moment concerned.

United India

This is the new picture of relationship between the provincial governments and the Centre. The contrast will be thrown in full relief when we consider that Education was a provincial subject since the days of the Government of India Act, 1919. The sphere of provincial control was subsequently further widened by the 'Autonomy' granted under the Government of India Act of 1935—Education as before remaining the provinces' exclusive preserve. Now under the new dispensation envisaged by this Post-War Education Plan, even education is to be centralised, thus scrapping whatever autonomy the provinces now enjoy. In other words, the future constitution, though not yet constitutionally framed, nevertheless promises a Centre stronger than even the present strong bureaucratic Centre which few Governments in the world can quite compare in its authoritarian control, and which

Muslims rightly consider' to be against their interests.

Present Position of League

Now, how is this to be reconciled with the oft-repeated statement that short of secession provinces must be vested with the fullest autonomy along with the mythical 'residuary powers?' Isn't it pardonable if one wonders as to what is really the intention of the British Government? On the one hand they piously assert that they 'would not be parties to the coercion of such (non-acceding) elements into submission to such government' and that '*... it is clear that the moment when the Commonwealth is engaged in a struggle for existence is not one in which fundamental constitutional issues can be decisively resolved*' and further that the provinces will have the right not to accede to the Indian Union. *Of Cripps Proposals, which the Viceroy recently announced in the Legislative Assembly said,* on the other hand, *in actual practice, over subjects like Education which have long remained the exclusive preserve of provincial governments are being taken over by the Centre* exposes the hollow nature of all the up-

declarations. What are the Musalmans to understand by these manœuvres? Nothing else but that there are two methods to achieve an end. Either you declare it and work towards it, or you work towards it and do not say anything about the end you have in mind. The British Government is adopting the second method of taking stealthy* steps towards a United India.

Other plans proceed from the same basis of a strong Centre. But these post-war plans cannot deceive Musalmans who know they are intended to militate against their objective of a separate independent Muslim India. Naturally Musalmans can only take them as a challenge to Pakistan.

Muslim Resolve to Achieve Pakistan

We do not want to suggest ourselves what attitude Musalmans will adopt to this challenge. We would much rather let their authoritative

*Government's privity in the matter has become quite clear from its choice of Sir Ardeshir Dalal—one of the sponsors of the Bombay Plan—as member in charge of Post-War Planning Department in Viceroy's Executive Council.

organisation speak. Expressing its fears that some kind of Federation was to be imposed the 1943 Delhi Session of the All-India Muslim League warned

“the British Government in all earnestness that the imposition of such a constitution will be resisted by Muslim India with all its might, which will inevitably result in strife, bloodshed and misery, the responsibility for which will rest on British Government alone.”

From Musalmans, the Resolution makes the demand of

“untiring efforts, willing sacrifice and grim determination to acquire the strength requisite to such an undertaking” (of achieving Pakistan).

Judging from the unmistakable determination of Musalmans for the achievement of Pakistan—a feeling we have been at pains to analyse in previous chapters—we bear unqualified testimony to the fact that Musalmans are resolved to suffer for their ideal.

APPENDIX

All-India Muslim League's Lahore Resolution of 1940

(1) While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolution dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October, 1939, and 3rd February, 1940, on the constitutional issue, this Session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in, the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

(2) It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October, 1939, made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act, 1935, is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India,

Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

(3) *Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.*

That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and

other rights and interests in consultation with them; and in other parts of India where the Musalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specially provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary.

